

# MID-AMERICA

*An Historical Review*

VOLUME 28, NUMBER 3

JULY 1946

# MID-AMERICA

*An Historical Review*

JULY, 1946

VOLUME 28

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 17

NUMBER 3

---

## CONTENTS

THE NARRATIVE OF OSCAR ONE BULL . . .	<i>Sister H. Inez Hilger</i>	147
THE "RECIT DES VOYAGES ET DES DECOUVERTES PERE JACQUES MARQUETTE" . . . . .	<i>Jean Delanglez</i>	173
NOTES AND COMMENTS . . . . .		195
BOOK REVIEWS . . . . .		205

---

### MANAGING EDITOR

JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

### EDITORIAL STAFF

WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL  
J. MANUEL ESPINOSA  
W. EUGENE SHIELS

RAPHAEL HAMILTON  
PAUL KINIERY  
JEAN DELANGLEZ

---

Published quarterly by Loyola University (The Institute of Jesuit History) at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, \$2.00; in foreign countries, \$2.50. Publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois. All communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor. Entered as second class matter, August 7, 1929, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry as second class matter at the post office at Effingham, Illinois. Printed in the United States.

# MID-AMERICA

## *An Historical Review*

JULY, 1946

VOLUME 28

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 17

NUMBER 3

---

## The Narrative of Oscar One Bull

### Introduction

While studying and recording the customs, beliefs, and traditions of the Sioux Indians during 1939 and 1940, I visited the Indian village of Little Eagle in the Standing Rock Reservation of the Dakotas. Here during visits to his home I gathered the narrative of Oscar One Bull, a Teton Sioux, the adopted son of Sitting Bull. Old and wrinkled he remains one of the few surviving members of his band. He was a young brave in the memorable years of Sioux history, the 1870's, the decade when nearly every Sioux man took an active part in the defence of the lands that gave sustenance to his people.

The Dakota Indians, more commonly known as the Sioux, were once many tribes speaking the Siouan tongue and ranging over a vast area of which the two Dakotas was about the center. Now there are seven tribes. The Teton tribe, like the others, is divided into bands, one of which is the Hunkpapa. One Bull is a Hunkpapa Teton. Despite the treaty between the Sioux and the United States Government in 1825 defining the eastern boundary of the Indians' land, the white men moved into the western portion of Minnesota and into an inevitable conflict with the Sioux. Following the Minnesota massacre of 1862 the Sioux were expelled from the state. Under Chief Red Cloud they were on the warpath from 1866 to 1868. On April 29, 1868, by treaty with the various bands of Teton Sioux, the boundaries of the Great Sioux Reservation were defined. Reserved was all the territory of South Dakota west of the Missouri River and the region of the Black Hills into Wyoming "for the absolute and undisturbed use and occupation of the Indians herein named. . . ." Furthermore, the country west and

north of the Great Sioux Reservation as far as the Big Horn Mountains was to remain unceded Indian territory, the Indians' exclusive hunting grounds, through which no White could pass without the consent of the Indians.

The exclusive use of the great pasture lands teeming with wild life was to belong to the Tetons for only a short time. Already during Civil War days white settlers had moved up the Missouri River and were eyeing the rich lands and antagonizing the Indians by a wanton destruction of their game. Already the gold seekers from the far west had moved into Wyoming and Idaho. Caught between miner and farmer the Sioux had recourse to weapons. The pathetic story of the results of their wars over broken treaties has been many times told.

Although scientific explorations had begun in the Black Hills as early as 1846, no active quest for precious metals was made until Custer's report of 1874 stimulated prospecting. By this time the aroused Sioux were organized by Sitting Bull and Crazy Horse. General George Armstrong Custer who had been sent into the Dakotas to check the uprising and to explore the possibilities of strategic forts and mineral resources, met with the chiefs at the Red Cloud Agency in 1874 and renewed the pledges to the Indians of the freedom of their lands from white intrusion. But in the following year the rich minerals were found, and a boom began which in the next quarter of a century yielded about \$100,000,000 in gold, silver, copper, iron, tin, and tungsten. When in 1875 the Sioux refused to cede the lands the policy of extermination appealed to the military leaders.

Sitting Bull (1837-1890), famed among his people for leadership, had long been a man feared by the Whites and a figure to deal with, by reason of his fifteen years opposition and wars. Other Teton leaders were gathered around him, especially Crazy Horse (1842-1877), the able Oglala Teton war chief, Red Cloud, Spotted Tail, Gall, Black Moon, American Horse, and Thunderhawk. Allied with them were other tribes of Sioux and the Cheyenne, totaling 5,000 braves. Against them went Generals Crook, Terry, and Gibbon in early 1876. By Spring the warring had moved well into Montana. There on June 26 beside the Little Big Horn River, Custer's force met disaster at the hands of Sitting Bull.

To establish peace anew an Indian commission appointed by Congress arrived during the Summer of 1876 in the Dakotas. Shamed and silent at the story of the chiefs the commission made a settlement that called for the cession of hunting lands outside



the reservation, removals of the Indians to reserved territory, land for each, and annuities. On September 26 all Teton bands save those led by Sitting Bull and Gall ceded their claims to the Black Hills. These chiefs fled with their people to Canada, where, as One Bull remarked, "they rested for a while and fed their children." A year later Crazy Horse was arrested on suspicion of having fomented trouble, and breaking away he was shot to death at Fort Robinson, Nebraska, September 5. Hardships and destitution forced Sitting Bull to accept an amnesty in 1879, and in 1887 the proud chief came to abide in the reservation.

The reform of the Indian policy wended its legal way until the Dawes Act of 1887, yet abuses in the administration of the laws continued. By an Act of Congress, March 2, 1889, the Great Sioux Reservation was divided, and the seven bands of Tetons were placed on the five smaller reservations existing today. The Hunkpapa reside on Standing Rock Reservation, the Oglala on the Pine Ridge Reservation of South Dakota, the Brulé on the Rosebud and Lower Brulé reservations in the same State, while the Blackfoot, Miniconjou, Sans Arc, and Two Kettles bands are on the Cheyenne River Reservation.

In 1890 the last armed conflict occurred between Tetons and Whites. A Teton delegation had returned from a visit to the Ghost Dance prophet in Nevada. This Indian Messiah was teaching his disciples that Ghost Dance followers would again be free of white domination. His words were welcomed by many Indians in the Sioux reservations and the Teton bands soon organized chapters of the Ghost Dance. Alarmed Government officials adopted measures to check a possible uprising. Sitting Bull was considered the likely leader, since for two years he had tried to prevent sales of Indian lands and had considered the treaties unreliable. Word for his arrest went out. In the process of the arrest Sitting Bull, his son, several braves or chiefs, and several Indian police were killed, December 15, 1890. Two weeks later the last armed conflict between the Teton Sioux and the United States happened on Wounded Knee Creek, South Dakota.

Oscar One Bull lived through these troublesome times.<sup>1</sup> His

<sup>1</sup> For the introductory information I have followed Paul Beckwith, *Notes on Customs of the Dakotas*, Smithsonian Report 1886, I, 245; P. E. Byrne, *Soldiers of the Plains*, New York, 1926; John C. Ewers, *Teton Dakota, Ethnology and History*, Berkeley, 1938; Charles J. Kappler, *Indian Affairs, Laws and Treaties*, Washington, 1904, II, 998; Francis Parkman, *The Oregon Trail*, Boston, 1930, 235-239; Stanley Vestal, *Sitting Bull*, Boston, 1932; *Dictionary of American Biography*, 1930, IV, 530-531; W. A. Graham, *The Story of the Little Big Horn*, New York, 1926.

father, Chief Makes Room, was a chief of the Miniconjou and brother-in-law of Sitting Bull, whom he accompanied during the wars. Since One Bull speaks only his native tongue, I used an interpreter. Much of the information relating to personal powers was given only because of the presence of Mr. Robert Byrne of Bismarck, who, as one adopted into One Bull's family, was singularly favored, for personal powers are thought to have their origin in the supernatural and are generally considered by older Indians as too sacred to be discussed with outsiders.

One Bull at the time of publication of this narrative is still living at Eagle River, a sincere friend of the Whites. Yet he remains a firm believer in all that his people believed and has not adopted Christianity, although his devoted wife was baptized by Father DeSmet and remained in the Christian fold until her death in February, 1941.

## Narrative of One Bull

I was born north of Baxia Butte [Bear Butte] on the Belle Fourche River in South Dakota. It was in the spring of the year, probably the month of April, in the year when Four Horns, a famous Crow Indian and warrior was killed [in the 1850's]. He was killed by the Sioux on this side [east] of the Black Hills in a war between the Crow and the Sioux. Sioux warriors could always spot him among the other Crow because of his war bonnet; it had four horns on it. All the old members of the Sioux nation living today know the story of the killing of Four Horns.

My father was a chief, Chief Makes Room. In the battle in which Four Horns was killed, One Horn<sup>2</sup> was the main chief and Makes Room was next; he was like the vice-president is today. My father belonged to the Miniconjou band, my mother to the Hunkpapa. Both belonged to the Teton tribe of Sioux.

The seven tribes of the Sioux had their origin with the kindling of seven fires. A long time ago there was no fire, nor did the people have any way to get fire. Now, there was one man who was closer to the *Ate* [the Almighty] than the other people. Every time this one praised *Ate*, he had visions. Whatever he asked of *Ate* while having a vision, he received. Once while the Sioux were

<sup>2</sup> One Horn (Ha-wan-je-tah), head chief of the Sioux, was described in 1832 by Catlin, who painted his picture, as a noble chief, an "elegant and high minded nobleman of the wilderness." George Catlin, *North American Indians*, Philadelphia, 1913, I, 249, and Plate 86.

camping, this man asked for fire. Fire was given him and he lighted seven camp fires—no more, no less—just seven. And that is how the seven tribes began, namely, the Mdewakanton, Wahpeton, Wahpekute, Sisseton, Yankton, Yanktonai, and Teton. Since the heart of this continent was then in the Black Hills, and all important things had their origin there, I believe that these people were given their fire right there in the Black Hills.

Now the Teton tribe, to which I belong, had seven bands: the Oglala, Brulé, Miniconjou, Two Kettles, Hunkpapa, Blackfoot, and Sans-Arc. My father was of the Miniconjou; my mother of the Hunkpapa. So now, by birth, I belong to the Miniconjou and the Hunkpapa. Since my parents belonged to these bands, there is no way in which I can separate from either one. Neither band, however, would accept me unless I lived with it. But this is what happened. Sitting Bull had two sisters. The older one was my mother; her name was Lady Pretty Feather. Now, Sitting Bull had a son who was born the same year I was. Well, this boy died when he was four years old. That same year Sitting Bull adopted me and I went to live with him. Now, he was a Hunkpapa. And since I lived with him, I am a Hunkpapa. But my father's people would also recognize me as one of their band if I came and lived with them. A band is obliged to recognize any one of its blood, and there is never any difficulty about it.

The Sioux Indians, like other Indians, have always been led by their chiefs. Chiefs inherited their position up to Sitting Bull's time. He was the last Sioux chief; there have been none since his time. [Several Sioux men present at this interview remarked: "One Bull is considered their chief by all the Teton Sioux today."]<sup>3</sup> Of course there were other chiefs in recent times, but they were really only ration chiefs. The Government [local employees of the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs] gave them the name of chiefs. For

<sup>3</sup> James Owen Dorsey recorded the following: "Among the Dakota it is customary for the rank and title of chief to descend from father to son, unless some other near relative is ambitious and influential enough to obtain the place. The same is claimed also in regard to the rank of brave or soldier, but this position is more dependent on personal bravery. Regarding chieftainship among the Dakota, Philander Prescott says: The chieftainship is of modern date, there being no chiefs before the whites came. The chiefs have little power. The chief's band is almost always a kin totem which helps to sustain him. The chiefs have no votes in council; there the majority rules and the voice of the chief is not decisive till then. On the death of a chief, the nearest kinsman in the right line is eligible. If there are no kin, the council of the band can make a chief. Civil chiefs scarcely ever make a war party." James Owen Dorsey, *Siouan Sociology*, Fifteenth Report, Bureau of American Ethnology, 1893-1894, 221-222.

example, a young man might happen to meet some United States official or he might be working at the Indian office here given out rations, and, if accidentally the superintendent or one of the officials would call him chief, well then, the fellows would call him chief, and he would begin to think he were a chief, and let himself be called that. In the old days such a man was no chief; such a man—one who did many brave deeds and was highly respected by the Indians—was considered a brave warrior, but never a chief.

In the old days even a man who by right of inheritance could be a chief had to have a good number of brave deeds to his credit before he could claim such rights. Yes, this is true. Chieftainship could not be passed on to a son unless the son had exercised kindness, had done many kind deeds for poor people. To try to be recognized as a chief without such a record would have been foolish; the people would not have recognized him as a chief. Sitting Bull had many kind acts to his credit. They say of him that while he was still young and when he was growing up, too, he always had a kind heart for old people; he always wanted to feed old people. So, his mother often gave a feast for old people and for those who were not able to help themselves. Yes, Sitting Bull was always doing things for everybody. He was kind to prisoners, too; he would never injure any of them.

Sitting Bull was not only a great chief, he also received special powers. When he was thirteen years old he went out scouting for horses. On his way he heard a man's voice singing from the top of the hill. He walked up to it, and found it to be an eagle. The eagle had sung: *Ate oyate kiu tawa makiya ca. Yuha iyotin ye wakiye lo.* [My father gave me this nation to care for and I am trying to fulfill my duty.] So Sitting Bull adopted this as his song. Stanley Vestal<sup>4</sup> was sitting here one day with a group of Indians, all in a circle. When this story was told, one of the men said, "This is the eagle on the dollar and is the one that is taking care of the nation. Sitting Bull saw it a long time ago."

Shortly after this event, when Sitting Bull was about fourteen years old, he counted coup<sup>5</sup> on a Crow Indian and was given the name of Sitting Bull by his father; his name before this time was

<sup>4</sup> Author of *Sitting Bull*, Boston, 1930.

<sup>5</sup> Coups could be counted, according to James Mooney, for the three brave deeds, namely, killing an enemy, scalping an enemy, or being first to strike an enemy either alive or dead. Each coup entitled a man to rank as a warrior and to recount the exploit in public. Frederick W. Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico*, Washington, 1912, I, 354.

Slow. The name Sitting Bull originated on an occasion when a man, after having done a brave deed, heard a buffalo call four names; he called Sitting Bull, Jumping Bull, One Bull, and Bull-Stands-with-a-Cow. The name One Bull was given to me one day when I returned home with some horses that I had stolen from the Crow. One Bull in Sioux is Tatanka Wanjila, *wanjila* meaning one. Names, however, usually are taken from a brave deed done by someone.

Beside the Crow Four Horns who was killed the year I was born, there was also a Sioux called Four Horns. In all probability this Sioux boy was named after Four Horns, the Crow. Probably the grandfather or the father of the Hunkpapa boy killed that Crow Four Horns and that gave him the right to use the name. This Hunkpapa Four Horns became a chief. He along with Red Horns, Voice Hawk and Running Antelope, were the four chiefs of the Hunkpapa who gave their power to Sitting Bull when Sitting Bull was made chief of all the Tetons.

I named all my grandchildren that have been given Indian names: my oldest grandson I named Four Horns; one of my granddaughters I named Bring Many Horses; another, Kills-in-the-Water. My other three grandchildren have not been named. The only child not of my own family that I named was a boy that died last spring; I named him just as soon as he was born. I felt very sad when he died. When he was being born, his people, who lived far away from where the doctors are, came for my wife and me. My wife helped with the birth. The man, Father-in-War, said, "If the baby is born and it is a boy, One Bull must name it." Any old person can give a name to a child, but usually grandparents give the name. By an old person we mean one that can no longer do all the work that is expected of a man or a woman.

And now I want to tell you how we stole horses from the Crow warriors. Our men were going out to raid one day, and I decided to go too, just to try my luck. I was eighteen years old at that time. It was daytime. About thirty of us rode up to the Crow camp, took the horses, and started back. It did not take long before the Crow caught up with us. The fight was on! The Crow were good fighters, very brave, and very skilled. I rode a buckskin colored horse. It was my first experience in horse stealing. I remember it well. I believe I did more fighting than any of the other boys. Well, we were driving the stolen horses and were being chased by the Crow. In a flash I turned my horse, galloped around the section of the band of Crows near me, and just about the time I was up to them, ready to strike coup, down they slid to the side of their running horses and



shot at me from behind them. White Bull was with us on this trip, but he was thinking more about the horses, I believe, than about fighting back. Anyway, we must have taken thirty horses on this raid because each man received a horse, and we were thirty men. [The interpreter remarked: "The old people around here say even today that when the Sioux got back to camp that day, the men said that if One Bull had not been with them the Crow would most certainly have recaptured their horses."]

One night the Crow stole horses from us. [The Crow were famed horse thieves.] They usually came at night; the Sioux went in broad day-light and did some fighting to get theirs. Well, I had three horses and I had them staked pretty close to our tepee, but the Crow Indians sneaked up and got them. Another time they took fifteen from me in one night, and that was taking every horse I had. One time, after I was married, I took my wife with me and we went out with Sitting Bull, Two Bulls, and another fellow to steal horses. We brought back twenty-three head!

No, I did not fast before my voice changed; no Sioux boys did. After I was twenty years old, however, I began to fast. A boy who was past twenty was expected to go out to fast and to pray in order that he might have a vision from which he would learn to direct his living.<sup>6</sup> Sometimes I fasted alone, away from everybody; I was young those days and could stand it. When I had the vision in which I received my power, I had fasted two days; I had fasted even from water. When I saw that vision I knew I was to live a right life. I was alone on a hilltop near Bear Butte. We were camping near there one winter. I came home and told the vision to Black Bone, Crazy Horse, Turns Holy, and Running Horse. These four men were waiting for me to come home to tell them my vision. They were sitting in a council tepee; other men were there, too, but they were persons of no importance. Women were not allowed to be present on such an occasion. I sketched my vision in the sand for these four men. Then one of the men took four puffs of the peace-pipe, between each puff telling me to be a brave man and predicting that from now on I would be able to withstand all hardships. After this he pointed the cup end of the pipe first, and then the mouthpiece, toward the earth and handed the pipe this way [mouthpiece preceding cup end] to the man to his left. Pointing the end pieces of the pipe toward the earth purified them. Then each of the other three men did likewise, the pipe always being

<sup>6</sup> For vision quests of the Teton see Frances Densmore, *Teton Sioux Music*, Bulletin 61, Bureau of American Ethnology, 1918, 157-283.

passed to the man at the left. This ceremony was like that of ordaining a man to the ministry is today; it gave me the right to carry out my powers. This is the only vision that I ever had that gave me powers. I had a vision in the Sun Dance that I gave in 1937, but it did not give me any powers. A representation of the power a man has is kept by him in a bundle which is considered sacred. The Sioux call this bundle *wotae*.

[At this point the informant was asked to describe the vision that gave him his *wotae*. He said that this was hard to discuss, but that he would get his *wotae* and show it to us. The interpreter prepared a place for it by spreading a clean cloth on the ground. When he returned with the bundle she opened it and spread the *wotae* on the cloth. The *wotae* was a piece of white muslin four feet square. In its center was drawn a male elk facing east, as seen in the vision. Dragon flies were sketched in the lower corners and above the back of the elk, and a butterfly to the front. To each of the four corners an eagle feather had been tied with a small strip of buckskin. At the ends of the two upper thongs a piece of bitterroot had been tied. These were not sacred feathers, but merely represented the four winds. A fifth eagle feather rested upon the cloth as he unfolded it. This he considered a sacred feather, and while holding it he sang and demonstrated the manner in which he prayed for rain. The interpreter explained that One Bull had power to make rain, to make the winds blow, to cause a cyclone, or to cause pleasant weather. He usually exercised this power when alone, though in an emergency he might do so in public. If he wishes a little rain, he shakes the bundle gently on his arm; if he wishes much rain he strikes the ground with the *wotae* and pours water on it.]

Whenever I have prayed to My Helper Above [God] and have taken this cloth and struck the ground with it, it has rained. Last October there was a fire in the Black Hills. I prayed. Soon it rained and put out the fire. The vision gave me power over the four winds. In the vision that gave me my *wotae*, it was early morning. It was cool. Someone woke me. I was looking toward the place of the rising sun. It was a man coming up instead of the rising sun; it was like a human being but it was also like an elk. The elk gave me my power in that vision. Yes, I have used my *wotae* with good effect. Not only can I control the four winds with it, but I also carried it with me in four battles and was not hurt. My *wotae* has always helped me.

Sitting Bull had a *wotae*. After the battle at Wounded Knee

[1890] we were all taken to Fort Yates and made to camp there. When we came back, all our belongings had been stolen, our cow and chickens and all we had left behind. Sitting Bull's *wotae* was gone, too.

In all the bands of the Sioux there were three classes of people. Everybody knew who they were, and there was not much intermarrying between them. All the members of our band, the Hunkpapa, were considered higher class by the Sioux Indians. Those of the higher class had not only chief's blood in their veins, but they were reared like their fathers and grandparents. They were trained to live up to the teachings of their elders. If anyone in this group in the early day did bad deeds, he had to leave the group. He was not wanted around any more; small children were not to learn bad traits from him. Everybody in that group was to live so that he could be looked upon as an example to be followed. In this class the women did bead work and tanning and drying fruit. They had plenty of everything. The men folks went out and brought in provisions for the women. A woman in those days liked a man who was a good provider of buffalo and deer, in fact one who was a good hustler.

The next class, the middle class, were good people but poor people. Although all the people had the same chances some were always poor. In some of these families the women were ambitious enough but their men could not do their share; or else the men were ambitious enough but the women were unable to do things or were too lazy to learn to do them.

The lower class were the ones that had done wrong. No one from the higher or middle class would marry any of these. If they did, they lost their standing with the upper classes. When camping out the higher class all camped together opposite the gate, with the chief in the center. The lower class camped near the gate.

I have no sons, but I have six daughters. These all have the same mother, my present wife; and I am satisfied to have them. Some families prefer boys, but girls are accepted when they arrive. The Sioux like children. Not much was said about a couple that had no children but it was thought that one of the two must have sinned—sinned like not liking children. The Sioux have a herb that is steeped and given to a sterile woman. It is always effective. I know the herb, but do not like to tell of it; it is very rare.

In all I had ten wives. I married for the first time when I was about twenty years old. I did not pay anything for my first wife; it was not necessary. I went up to her and talked to her and



before I even asked her to marry me, she asked me to take her home. So I did: I took her to Sitting Bull's home. Sitting Bull was much pleased that I was married. But that woman did not treat me right; so I quit her. I went away, and then she went back to her people. I stayed with her just a few nights. Her mother and father were very nice people. She did not treat me right, that is why I left her! I went to my father's people and lived with them for one year.

In old days when a man was ready to marry a woman he selected one and if she satisfied him, he married her.<sup>7</sup> He merely brought her to his tepee where she lived with him: that was the marriage. There was no marriage ceremony. The man's mother usually gave a feast for the couple, and because of this everybody knew that this woman was her son's wife. Other men would know from this that this woman was now married. Sometimes the man arranged with the parents of the woman he wished to marry. I did that twice. One time when I wanted to marry a woman I went out hunting and caught three deer. I brought these to the parents of the girl, but they told me I would have to bring two horses also. Well, I could not afford to give that much for the girl so I did not marry her.<sup>8</sup>

Just once I had more than one wife [simultaneously] and that lasted one night! They were so jealous of each other that I left both of them. The other women that I married were no good: they were mean and were not able to take care of me. By one of these marriages I had two children. When I sent the woman away, she took one of the children, a girl, with her; I kept the one she left behind, a boy. After she died I went to her place and brought the girl back to my home. I got rid of this woman because she threw a piece of bread at our little girl when she asked for something to eat. Well, that was enough for me; I let her go. My present wife reared both of these children.

<sup>7</sup> Courting among the Dakotas, writes Paul Beckwith, "is always done in the evening and in the lodge. If the attentions of the young man are disagreeable to the young woman, she will get up and blow out the fire. The young man takes the hint and retires. If, on the contrary, she should be willing she lets the fire alone." Paul Beckwith, *Notes on Customs of the Dakotas*, Smithsonian Report for 1886, I, 256. Cf. also Charles A. Eastman, *My Indian Boyhood*, Boston, 1933, 125.

<sup>8</sup> Paul Beckwith recorded in 1886 that the Sioux "purchase their wives by tying a horse at her parents' door; if, on returning the following day, they find the horse there, they will add another, keeping this up until their limit is reached; if the horses are taken away he will then enter the lodge and take his bride home; if it requires more horses than he is willing to give he takes his horses away and tries elsewhere." *Notes*, 256.

Sometimes when a couple was separating, the man hit a drum once and threw the stick into the air.<sup>9</sup> This meant: Whoever is able to take care of this woman, and thinks he can live with her, can have her. I never did that; some, however, did. I just quit the women. The man does not in any way support the woman after they have parted.

Years ago I adopted my adopted brother's son, a four-year-old boy named John Growler; his father was dying of tuberculosis. I invited his mother, his mother's mother, and all his relatives who might have had a claim to him, to a feast. These discussed the matter among themselves and when all were satisfied that I might adopt the boy, one of the relatives expressed the sentiment of all in a short speech. The boy then stayed with us. We treated him the same as our own children. But he died very young. Had he lived he should have inherited from me just like my own children.

I always wanted a son; but here is what happened: When I was thirty years old I shot my first eagle, the only one I ever shot. I shot it on this side of Bullhead [Standing Rock Reservation] near Haystack Butte. I was going along one day when I noticed an eagle sitting up there on the butte. Just as he started to take flight I shot him. I shot him to get his feathers; eagle feathers are valuable, the tail feathers more so than the wing feathers. The men in our locality heard that I had shot an eagle and came to my house. I gave a feather to each one of the men who had the reputation of being a brave man. These were Running Horse, Crazy Bull, Red Feather, and Turns Holy. Eagle feathers could be worn only by chiefs, sons of chiefs, councilmen and warriors. All others could wear feathers of other birds and wear them anywhere on the body, but not on the head. The chiefs wore only one feather and it was worn on the back of the head with the quill end stuck through two little braids of hair one above the other; the other end of the feather showed above the head. Councilmen, sons of chiefs, and warriors wore their feathers at angles on the side of their head. If a warrior returned from a battle in which he had done a brave deed, someone might hand him an eagle feather. He would stick this into his hair on the side of his head and in whatever manner it happened to

---

<sup>9</sup> "The Dakotah is a polygamist, having as many as five wives. The marital tie is not very binding, and divorces are not sought after in the courts; but in the straw dance they will 'throw away' those wives they no longer wish to retain; in many instances they will take 'unto themselves' several wives in order to throw them away at this dance, believing it will add to their importance to have so strong a heart." *Ibid.*

be, well that would be his way of wearing it. Only one braid was made on the side of the head to hold the feather. If the warrior had killed an enemy, he was entitled to wear a red feather. Well, I gave away those eagle feathers.

For a long time after I killed that eagle I could hear his voice calling my name. I killed only that one in all my life and I felt I was punished for it. There is a belief among the Indians that if a man kills an eagle he will lose his eldest son. It was probably because of this that our adopted boy died. Only a man who cannot have children should kill eagles.

I always wanted a boy in our family, but it seemed we could not have any because I had shot that eagle. After my four-year-old boy died, I looked wherever I went for a boy that I might adopt. Years went by but I never found any. In 1936 I went to Bismarck, North Dakota, for the celebration. It was on the Fourth of July. One of our young men got into trouble and we heard that Mr. Robert Byrne, who was then Secretary of State of North Dakota, had helped him out of his difficulty. I heard of this kind deed and when I saw Mr. Byrne I felt that he was the man I wanted to take to replace my lost boy. I felt that he had the right kind of heart; that is why I wanted to adopt him as my son. I asked the chiefs of the Reservation who were present at the celebration what their opinion was in the matter. They agreed that I adopt Mr. Byrne in Bismarck, since we could not perform the adoption ceremony among the Indians down in South Dakota where our homes were. That evening it was announced from a platform [erected for a performance in front of the Broadway Drug Store] that I would adopt Mr. Byrne. So it was before the people that Mr. Byrne became my son. We gave him the name of *Heluta* [Red Horn]. We held the ceremony of the Fox Lodge on a Sunday morning. The Indians present sang a song in the Sioux language. I sang the two that Sitting Bull used to sing: *Ate oyate kin tawa makiya ca. Yuba iyotin ye wakiye lo.* [My father gave me this nation to care for and I am trying to fulfill my duty.] I also told how I missed my boy and that I wanted Mr. Byrne to be my son. I told the Indians of the assistance Mr. Byrne had given the boy of our tribe and that according to my judgment he had a very kind heart. After this the Indians again sang and danced for Mr. Byrne; then we put an eagle feather on his head and everybody shook hands with him. The dance was a special dance; it was the adoption dance of the Fox Lodge. Since I am the head of that lodge I adopted my son through its cere-

mony.<sup>10</sup> I do not know where the name Red Horn originated, but I believe it had its origin in a battle. I knew Red Horn was the best of men, with knowledge enough for a chief. I never gave the name to anyone except Mr. Byrne.

The Fox Lodge was a warrior society [*akicita*]. We had seven of these: the Fox, Silent Eaters, Badger Boy, White Horse, Grass Dancers, and White Burden.<sup>11</sup> These societies were found in all the bands. None found anywhere were as brave as the Hunkpapa Midnight Strong Hearts. None of the lower class people were allowed to join any of these. The middle class could become members if they did brave deeds and were good people. One was not a stepping stone to the other, but the Midnight Strong Hearts were considered the highest. The *wotae* power had nothing to do with these, nor did all members of one society have the same *wotae* power. Their meetings were secret but their dances were open to all. Each lodge, except the Silent Eaters, had its own songs, dances, and ceremonies. The Silent Eaters had none. No women belonged to any of the men's lodges; but they were usually invited to help with the singing.

[One Bull had been a participant in many of the battles of the Sioux and the United States. Each of the participants, however, has a different account of the particular battles depending upon his own activity. In view of the many verbal accounts it is impossible to check all and piece together an accurate picture. One Bull was aware that he differed from others, but he insisted that he was

<sup>10</sup> Mr. Robert Byrne confirmed and amplified One Bull's description of the adoption. The young Indian for whom he performed the good deed was the grandson of One Bull; the deed consisted of getting the young fellow's truck repaired and feeding him and fourteen Standing Rock Reservation Indians who had come to participate in the North Dakota Golden Jubilee Celebration. Adoption is the highest honor which an Indian can give. Part of the ceremony was held in public and the remainder on the following Sunday at the earth lodge on the capitol grounds where the family of One Bull was housed.

<sup>11</sup> Similar societies are found among all the plains tribes. They were recorded by Lewis and Clark as existing among the Sioux as early as 1804. Reuben Gold Thwaites, *Original Journal of Lewis and Clark Expedition, 1804-1806*, New York, 1904, I, 130. Wissler records six societies as existing among the Oglala on Pine Ridge and Rosebud reservations, namely the Kit Fox, Crow Owners, Strong Hearts, Badgers, Bare-lance Owners, and White-marked. Only the first four of these were found among the Teton Sioux on the Standing Rock Reservation by Densmore. Densmore furthermore notes that her informants considered the Silent Eaters also known as Strong-Heart-at-Night as secret societies and entirely distinct from the Strong Hearts listed by Wissler and described by her. Clark Wissler, *Societies and Ceremonial Associations in the Oglala Division of the Teton-Dakota*, American Museum of Natural History Anthropological Papers, 1912, XI, Part I, 5, and Frances Densmore, *Teton Sioux Music*, Bulletin 61, Bureau of American Ethnology, 1918, 313.

right. The omission of the battle details will have to be pardoned by historians. When shown a photograph of Custer, One Bull after long consideration said in a serious tone: "I never saw Long Hair. So this is what Long Hair looked like." He passed the picture to his wife, saying: "This is Long Hair." She looked at it intently, quietly uttering short exclamations and sighs, and then said: "So this is the man. No matter whether he was right or not, he was bound to have his way."]

When Custer went into the Black Hills [in 1874] we were living on the river around Mormaria; we found gold while there. But the United States soldiers were all over; so we went to Canada for a rest and to feed our children. The Canadian Government treated us very well. The Major General up there was my friend and we got along very well; really our people were well treated there.

I took part in a battle fought on Rosebud Creek. Several tribes of Indians as well as some United States soldiers fought on the side of the Sioux and we beat the Whites. Five nights after that we fought Custer's battle [June 25-26, 1876]. Custer was a very heartless man! He killed the mother of a man who now lives in Rapid City [South Dakota]. They say the mother was shot while nursing him; he was just a baby. Custer was very heartless.

And now I want to tell you about a dream I had. I dreamed one time, when I was about thirty years old, that I heard somebody talking. I looked up and saw that the voice came from the sunrise. The voice said to me: "This is the power of the Sioux Nation," and it pointed to something that I could see very well was the center pole of the Sun Dance. I could see many people running toward the pole and the sunrise. The voice said to me then, "You are to do this." I believe that this dream has helped me to live a long life; that it has brought me to my old age. After that dream I took part in a number of Sun Dances.

One winter [1936] I promised to put on a Sun Dance if my daughter would get well. She had been operated on. She got well and I kept my promise and put on the Sun Dance for our people in July [1937]. That was the first Sun Dance that we held since 1881.<sup>12</sup> Persons who helped me with the early preparations were my wife, my three daughters, the children of my eldest daughter,

<sup>12</sup> Photos by Ivan Dmitri of One Bull's Sun Dance held July 1 and 2, 1937, are reproduced in the *Saturday Evening Post* of September 4, 1937, 18-19. The brief account accompanying the pictures notes that the last Sun Dance was given by the Sioux in 1881.



and two old men who knew the ways of putting on a Sun Dance. We all took a sweat bath before we began to prepare. That is a custom and is considered a sacred bath. The two old men helped me with the work: one cut the tongues of beef into thin slices, while the other, a medicine man named Kills Pretty Enemy, helped me with things in general. My wife sliced the buffalo tongue, the one that I ate because I gave the Sun Dance. A piece of the buffalo tongue was put into the sacred bag that was hung on one of the cross poles of the Sun Dance lodge; the root end of it was put into the hole into which the center pole was placed. The buffalo tongue, but not the beef tongues, was roasted in ashes. This caused the meat to become dry and prevented spoiling. My youngest daughter got the buffalo tongue by writing to a man in the Black Hills. We prepared all things used in the Sun Dance and then hid them away for thirty days.

Then on the last days of June we erected the Sun Dance lodge. Near the top of the center pole we tied branches of the wild cherry and the Juneberry, a buffalo robe, and a woman's beaded buckskin sewing bag. The bag held some buffalo fat, an awl used in making moccasins, some sinew, a bone scraper used in scraping buffalo hides, some buffalo tongue, and images of the buffalo and the crescents of the sun and the moon, all three cut out of cardboard and painted. The wild cherry and Juneberry branches were a petition that all fruits should grow well that season. No eagle was tied to the pole, but a little distance below the sacred bundle we attached this buffalo head. [He pointed at a buffalo skull.] These things represented the buffalo, man, sun, moon, and stars. No sage was hung anywhere. It was strewn over the ground that formed the floor. It is the custom that all things that are tied as offerings to the center pole are not to be touched by anyone, but are left there. The offerings I made in 1937 were left there for a long time. One of the men near here finally took them down, but he died soon after, and it was said that he had done wrong by taking them down and was punished for it.

The ceremonies began Friday night when all those who were taking part took a sweat bath. Among these were twelve men dancers—these also did the singing—my granddaughter, my grandnephew, my daughter, and a Sioux woman. [This woman while stranded in Germany, had promised to take part in a Sun Dance if she would arrive safely in the United States.] None of the Sun Dancers drank any water from Friday midnight until Sunday sunset, and only the twelve dancers were allowed to eat anything. These

were given marrow cooked especially for them in ashes; eating the ashes which stuck to the marrow cleared their throats and prevented hoarseness. The singers were not allowed to talk to anybody, nor were they allowed to go among the women. All was very solemn. Not even a dog was allowed to cross near the tepee where the men were. Of the twelve singers six sang and danced at one time.

My granddaughter held the peace pipe. She could do this because she was a virgin. She impersonated increase in Indian population. The pipe must be held toward the sun. If smoke comes from it without anyone smoking or lighting it, the prayer is answered; if no smoke comes from it, the prayer is not answered. The pipe that my granddaughter held last July smoked of its own accord. I myself put the kinnikinnick into it and I know I had not lit it. I was praying for rain at that time and we had rain. During that Sun Dance, too, the buffalo head moved of its own accord; it faced east and turned by itself finally facing west. When that happened the Indians wept.

One man moved about swinging a wand before those who were taking part. He tried to distract them. If a man's mind is strong, no one can distract him; if he is distracted and shows confusion, it is a sign that he has not made up his mind to worship. Isadore Waters carried the wand.

Formerly, those who took part in the Sun Dance tortured themselves.<sup>13</sup> I had my skin gashed in a hundred place for one Sun

<sup>13</sup> Paul Beckwith, *Notes*, 250, recorded regarding the Dakota Sun Dance in the 80's that "to each of the three poles in the center forming a triangle is fastened a stout thong, as high as a man's head is from the ground. The dancer takes his place in the center of the triangle, and making incisions through the flesh on shoulders and breast, ties the ends of thongs through the incisions and places between his lips a small quill whistle through which he breathes, at each respiration giving a shrill whistle. He is clothed only in a shawl tied around his waist falling to his knees, his body painted black, hair loose and hanging upon his shoulders, and with rings of white rabbit-skins tied in his flesh on shoulders and legs. As the sun sinks below the horizon this dance of torture is commenced by a low sidewise motion of the body, as each foot is raised and lowered, their eyes following the course of the sun as it revolves around the earth and as it rises above the horizon their eyes are kept fastened upon it. This is kept up until sunset, if the dancer has not succumbed through weakness before this; he tugs and strains in his efforts to pull the thongs through the flesh, and finally falling with his whole weight tears the thongs through, generally rendering himself insensible." Cf. also J. O. Dorsey, *A Teton's Account of the Sun Dance*, Eleventh Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1889-1890, 450-464. Cf. *Ibid*, 460-464 for types of torture. Cf. also Densmore, *loc. cit.*, 85-151, and Wilson D. Wallis, "The Sun Dance of the Canadian Dakota" in Clark Wissler, *Sun Dance of the Plains Indians*, Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, 1921, XVI.

Dance, when I was about twenty years old. The United States Government has forbidden torture, and so we no longer have it.<sup>14</sup> However, I know of no one who died because of the tortures of the Sun Dance.

The pipe that is used at the Sun Dance must never have been touched by women, except by the one who made it. The woman who makes it knows how to do so. Not all women know how to do it. This piece [section preceding the mouthpiece] must be especially designed and must be made of porcupine quills. The one I used in the Sun Dance in 1937 was made by Mrs. Charlie Looking Back. The woman who makes it must be a good, clean, honest woman. When the pipe is stored away a smoke must be made of sage and then the pipe is wrapped and stored away safely and nicely.

The Sun Dance is offered to *Ate*—to the Creator, the Almighty One, the One that makes the sky and the earth, the sun, the moon and the stars. And He is *Ate*. We do not consider the earth and the moon, the sun and the stars as gods, for they listen to and obey *Ate* the same as we people on earth do. The old Sioux believed in the same God as we do—in a Father beyond, One greater than the sun—but they also prayed to the sun because the sun is powerful enough to bring light into the world. They believed that through the sun they could see the power *Ate* had over the world. The sun is the strongest force in the world. Beyond the sun is the One that made the sun, the One that we all worship. It is one and the same God that you and we all worship: all people pray to the same God. A long time ago our forefathers told us that there is just one God. When Father DeSmet came, the people knew whom he was talking about when he spoke of God. Long before he came our people used

<sup>14</sup> In answer to an inquiry regarding the content of the Act of the U. S. Government forbidding torture at the Sun Dance, John Collier, Commissioner of U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, wrote under date of February 24, 1941: "Under the Indian regulations of 1904 of the Department of the Interior, practice of the sun dance was considered an Indian offense. The exact regulations read as follows:

"The 'sun-dance,' and other similar dances and so-called religious ceremonies, shall be considered 'Indian offenses,' and any Indian found guilty of being a participant in any one or more of these 'offenses' shall for the first offense committed, be punished by withholding from him his rations for a period not exceeding ten days; and if found guilty of a subsequent offense under this rule, shall be punished by withholding his rations not less than fifteen days or more than 30 days, or by incarceration in the agency prison for a period not exceeding 30 days.

"It is probably due to this regulation, plus the loss of the buffalo and the function of the dance in Sioux life, that it has been abandoned rather than any single prohibition of the torture features. Since 1935 this regulation and any other prohibitions on Indian religion have been removed . . . The 1904 regulation is of course no longer in effect."



to tell this story: A long time ago there lived a noted man. He died. They were taking this man away to bury him: they were carrying this learned man to the Great Dipper, to the cup part of it. That is where they were carrying him to. Following him, were the people. Now, this meant that the Indians should follow this one good man. From the bible stories that we now hear, we think that maybe this man was Christ.

[During a subsequent visit, the informant tried to clarify the religious beliefs of his people.] *Ate* means Almighty Father and so does *Wakan tanka*. *Wakan* means holy and *tanka* means great or big. *Ate* means the Almighty One. One is not higher than the other; *Ate* and *Wakan tanka* are the same. Both of them are something beyond the sun which we prayed to in the old days. It is the same as Jesus is nowadays. I think of Jesus and *Ate* and *Wakan tanka* as the same power, as the Supreme Being. *Ate* and the sun are not the same. *Ate* is beyond the sun. We never worshipped the sun, but we knew that the sun, too, had power. We did not consider the sun and the sky and the rocks as gods or as being powers by themselves; we did not worship them but we knew that there was power in all of them from God. God's will was in each of them. [For example:] Before Custer's battle Sitting Bull prayed to God for power to conquer. In his prayer he saw soldiers coming with heads down and then he knew that God was giving him the power to defeat the enemy. The right order is this: We pray first to *Ate*, then to *Wakan tanka*, then to Listen-to-me [or Hear Me]: these are all *Wakan tanka*. Then come the living beings: these are the four winds, the buffalo and the eagle, the bear and other animals. The buffalo and the eagle, however, must come before the bear and other animals; and then come the human beings. None of them are especially female or male, but both female and male are classed together.<sup>15</sup>

We have a custom that those who dream of a horse or an elk or a buffalo must act out that dream before the crowd. I had to put on a dance last year, because I dreamed of a horse, a white horse. We call such a dance a Horse Dance. I dreamed that a white horse was coming toward me. Therefore, I rode a white horse at the dance. No one wanted to help me with the ceremonies because they thought they could not do them right. They must be acted out very exactly. If they are not acted out right, we may

<sup>15</sup> This information differs from that given by Dorsey in *A Teton's Account of a Sun Dance*, 432 ff., and by Clark Wissler, *loc. cit.*

expect a bad storm. No, I never heard of societies being formed by those who had these dreams.

No, the Sioux around here do not eat peyote;<sup>16</sup> they believe it is "medicine." At Pine Ridge [South Dakota] they eat it. [One Bull's daughter then told of a peyote "service" at Pine Ridge at which she had been present.] Our people around here do not believe in the peyote religion nor in the Ghost Dance religion.<sup>17</sup> I do not think that the peyote religion is very good; and I do not approve of the Ghost Dancers. The Native American Church are peyote eaters.<sup>18</sup>

[When shown flint arrows collected in the Osage country in Oklahoma by Mr. Robert Byrne, One Bull withdrew his hands refusing to touch them.] They are the kind used in killing people; I am afraid of them. We do not believe in touching anything that was used in killing an Indian. Our Indians did not make flint arrows. We believe they were made by spiders. I used arrows with steel points.<sup>19</sup>

That makes me think of buffalo hunting. When a man decided to get a buffalo he went out to the herd, looked it over, and selected

<sup>16</sup> Peyote (*Lophophora Williamsii*. Lem. Coulter.) (*Onkseksela* in Siouan). The Spanish missionary Padre Bernardino de Sahagún (1529) describes the Aztecs as eating "certain black mushrooms, which they called nanacatl, which intoxicate and cause visions to be seen and even provoke sensuousness." James Mooney of the Bureau of Ethnology called attention to the use of the drug by Indians in the United States in 1891. W. E. Stafford, U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1915, identified the nanacatl as the mescal or peyote, a spineless cactus (*Lophophora williamsii* or *Lophophora lewinii*) shaped like a carrot or turnip. The flowerlike tip of the plant, when dried, resembles a button or mushroom, and is the peyote used by the Indians. Huntington Cairns, "A Divine Intoxicant," *Atlantic Monthly*, Nov. 1929, 638-645. The author also relates his experiment associated with peyote influence, as well as earlier recorded personal experiments in peyote eating by physicians and psychologists of note. See also Melvin R. Gilmore, *Uses of Plants by the Indians of the Missouri River Region*, Thirty-third Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1911-1912, 104-106.

<sup>17</sup> The Ghost Dance religion is fully described by James Mooney in the *Fourteenth Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, 1892-1893, Part II including its history and its practices among the Arapaho, Cheyenne, Comanche, Paiute, Sioux, Kiowa, Apache, and Caddo. Pages 1057-1078 are devoted to the Sioux. Cf. also Luther Standing Bear, *My People, the Sioux*, Boston, 1928, 217-230.

<sup>18</sup> Frances Densmore, recording songs of the Native American Church, writes: "The Native American Church is a development of the peyote cult and appears to be spreading in the United States." *American Anthropologist*, January-March 1941, 77-79. Cf. also Documents on Peyote, *Report of the United States Office of Indian Affairs*, May 18, 1937.

<sup>19</sup> Otis Tufton Mason recorded in 1893 that the Sioux procured iron, centuries ago, and substituted it for stone heads; that one of the rarest specimens in any museum is a Sioux arrow with a jasper point. *North American Bows, Arrows, and Quivers*, Smithsonian Report of 1893, 672.

the one he wanted. Buffalo had to be shot right in the side, and never were two arrows used on one buffalo. I usually brought home two buffalo, one for my family and one for the people that were helpless. No one ever killed just for the fun of killing, like so many Whites did.<sup>20</sup> When we had too much meat we dried and stored it.

I killed my first buffalo when I was about eighteen years old; it was the year the thirty Crow Indians were killed. The best hunting grounds lay within the area surrounded by the North Platte River, the Rocky Mountains, the Missouri River and the Canadian line. Buffalo hunting is now over. Once in a while the Government gives us a buffalo. Two summers ago while skinning one that was to be used during the Rushmore Memorial Celebration, another smelled the blood and started after us. We were obliged to take shelter in our car.

In former days the buffalo furnished the greatest part of our food. We also ate wild plums, cherries, Juneberries, and bullberries. We ate these fresh and also dried and stored them for winter. Today most of the people around here preserve them by boiling them. My daughter still dries wild plums and wild cherries each year for me and for her old mother. We walk down to her house each day and eat some; she keeps them on the table so we can help ourselves. It seems old people have to have these to keep well.

In the old days we cooked thick soup. We cooked it in the lining of the buffalo paunch. First we boiled dried berries or cherries in water with small pieces of buffalo meat; then later we added shavings that came off the buffalo hide. These thickened the soup. As late as 1920 I cooked soup in the lining of a cow paunch. It was the summer before I fell from the hayrack and hurt my back. I fastened the edges of the paunch to a tripod made of small sticks. Then I filled it with water and placed five hot stones so big [size of his fist] into the water. I had heated the stones in the fire nearby. After the water boiled, I put small pieces of meat into it, and some cherries.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> George Catlin describes the plains around them in every direction as being speckled with herds of grazing buffalo. He describes the officers and men of his party as "dealing death to these poor creatures to a most cruel and wanton extent for the pleasure of *destroying*, generally without stopping to cut out the meat. During yesterday and this day, several hundreds have undoubtedly been killed, and not so much as the flesh of half a dozen used." *North American Indians*, Philadelphia, 1857, II, 511.

<sup>21</sup> Wissler describes a similar procedure of cooking food among the Blackfoot and notes that it agrees in all essential details with the method

When buffalo were scarce and the people were on the point of starving we ate dogs, that is, puppies in the prime of life.<sup>22</sup> When their bodies are too heavy for their small legs, dogs seem to be running sidewise; well, that is when they are in the prime of life. It was our custom also to eat dog meat at certain ceremonies, like the clown dance. But it was not part of our regular diet; we ate dog meat only when people were starving and there were no buffalo. Since most families had faced such a time, every family kept a female dog and considered her valuable. Puppies would then be on hand should it happen that children were hungry and people were starving.

The Sioux liked fish of all kinds and ate them even though buffalo were plentiful. Fish were caught by lines made by twisting hairs of a horse's tail. [He illustrated the process by twisting some hairs between his index fingers and thumbs.] The line was made the right length, then tied to a pole made of the branch of a tree. To the other end we tied the leg or breast muscles of a bird. No hooks were used. After the fish swallowed the meat we pulled it out of the water. I caught my first fish when I was about ten.

The men of our tribe have always taken sweat baths to keep well; they do so today. They sweat in tepees near the river, and right afterward they plunge into the cold water of the river. I often take a sweat bath; it keeps me well and strong.

The Sioux did not divide life, like you say the Chippewa did.<sup>23</sup> Here is what we did: From birth to one year we called *hok'sicala* [baby]; from one year to ten we called *hoksila* [boy] or *winceneala* [girl]; from ten to eighteen years, *ko'skala-ciquala* [young boy] or *wiko'skalaka-ciqualal* [young girl]; from eighteen to twenty years, *ko'skalaka-tanka* [big young man] or *wiko'skalaka-ciqualal* [young woman]; from twenty to old age, *wica'sa* [man] and *wica'rcala* [old man] and *winyan* [woman] and *winu'rcala* [old woman]. Old age is when a man or a woman is no longer able to do the work that he or she had always done and was expected to do. Some enter

used by the Sioux. Clark Wissler, *Material Culture of the Blackfoot Indians*, American Museum of Natural History Anthropological Papers, 1910, V, 27, 45.

<sup>22</sup> For dog meat as food see also Beckwith, *Notes*, 255, and Catlin, *North American Indians*, I, 258-260. For the Dakota menu in general see Francis Parkman, *The Oregon Trail*, Boston, 1930, 186-187; Beckwith, *loc. cit.*, 254; and F. V. Hayden, *Contributions to the Ethnography and Philology of the Indian Tribes of the Missouri Valley Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, Philadelphia, 1862, 369-371.

<sup>23</sup> For Chippewa customs see the writer's *Chippewa Child Life and Its Cultural Background*, a forthcoming publication of the Bureau of American Ethnology.

this age at sixty; I did not enter it until I was eighty. When a boy's voice broke it was a sign that he was becoming a man. The bravest and most honest man in the locality then took such a boy and threw him into cold water, usually into the river. This was to train the boy in having a brave heart; it was to teach him patience and to give him a chance to show that he could control his anger. He had to learn to endure this kind of thing and other hardships as well. I was thrown into the river three times by my father. He did rough things like that to me to see if I would get angry. I was the youngest boy in our family and had a hard time growing up. My older brothers and cousins teased me a good deal.

Our people divided the year into four seasons. We called them *waniyeta* [winter], *wetu* [spring], *bloketu* [summer], and *ptaniyetu* [autumn].<sup>24</sup> Each season has three moons. The year begins with the winter; it begins in the moon when the leaves are all brown and fall from the trees, and when the cranes from the north fly south bringing snow with them. When this happens people say "Winter is here." Winter has arrived when all birds have gone south, and all animals and everything else seek sheltered places. Soon buffalo and other animals will have grown enough hair to keep them warm in cold weather. This happens about the second moon in winter. The peak of the winter is when frost forms in the houses, and when trees crack because of the cold. We also knew we were in this moon if, by accident, the men killed a buffalo cow and found that its unborn calf looked blue and had only a few hairs on its nose.

Spring begins when the snow has melted and there is another fall of snow and when one, in past days, could see the tracks of buffalo on it. That is how we could tell that the buffalo had left their sheltered places. When grass grows and buds burst we know spring is here for certain. When calves and all animals are fattening and are jumping and frolicking around, the third moon of spring has come.

When the new-born birds try to fly, summer is here. It is mid-summer, or peak of summer, when cherries turn black. In early days when the buffalo calves, the ones born that spring, turned dark, it was the third moon of summer.

Fall sets in when birds of a kind gather together and prepare to fly away in flocks. In the next moon, the wild plums are com-

<sup>24</sup> Hayden's account gives the same terminology: *we'-tu*, spring, three moons, coming in of spring; *bel-o-ke'-tu*, fair weather, coming in of summer; *ptan'-e-tu*, coming in of autumn, three fall months; *wa-ni'-i-tu*, coming in of winter, three winter months. *Contributions*, 376.



pletely ripe and fall easily from their branches. The end of the fall is here when leaves begin to turn brown and red and yellow and begin to fall.

Our day begins when the morning star rises. Soon after that a bird wakes up and chirps; that is a sign it is daybreak. When the sun appears, the Sioux say *anpao*. When the sun is about there [at an angle of 45° with the zenith] it is *binbauna* or *wicokau* [forenoon]. It is *hujaye* when the sun is directly overhead. It is *comiyaye* [afternoon] when the sun is half way toward sunset. The day is nearly gone then. *Htayetü* [evening] means the sun is going down.

I was trained as a boy to be up before sunrise, and all my life I have been up before the sun. For five years now I have not seen the morning star; I don't know what has happened to it. I can see daybreak, but not the morning star. Every morning before the daybreak I sing: *Toka heya wamayag upe. Taku waste wamayag upe. Ina maka ta uyapelo.*" This means, "My father sent me to this earth, and he sent me the buffalo on which to live. My mother, too, was sent down to earth. She comes to this world to carry out a mission: to beget children and to bring forth a nation." My grandson rises with me; we stand out in the open, our right hands towards the rising sun, and sing this song together.

The Sioux did not divide their time into weeks. If a man wished to count nights very accurately—nights and not days were counted—he marked his pipe stick with grooves. [The stick was used in plugging tobacco into the cup of the pipe.] Each groove represented a night. We knew how many nights it took for the moon to get to a quarter, so it was easy to count the nights ahead. We might want to know this if we were sending word to another tribe that we would meet them at a certain time.

Instead of counting by week like the Whites did, we counted by moons. A moon begins "when the moon is dead" [new moon]. *Witanin* means "the moon is showing" or "the moon is coming to life" [first quarter]; *wiatayatanin* means "the moon has come to life" or "all of the moon is showing" [full moon]; *wiyaspapi* means "moon is dying" or "a part is eaten off the moon" [last quarter].

The names of our moons were: Frost-in-the-house or first-of-winter [December]; Middle-of-winter [January]; When-trees-crack [February]; Hair-grows-on-the-calf or People-have-sore-eyes-from-the-snow-blindness [March]; Buffalo-have-calves [April]; When-crocuses-blossom [May]; When-Juneberries-ripen-and-turn-black [June]; Middle-of-summer [July]; Cherries-turn-black or Cherries-

turn-ripe [August]; Plums-turn-scarlet-red [September]; When-leaves-turn-yellow [October]; When-leaves-are-off-trees or When-cranes-come-back-from-the-North [November].<sup>25</sup>

We did not have many ways of predicting weather. We still say that if the horns of the moon point toward the earth at first quarter, we shall have cool weather; we say the moon is chilled. If the horns point up, we say, "This month we are going to have good weather." If ducks, or any fowl, fly low on their way south, we know rain will soon fall; if they fly high, clear weather will come. A rainbow also predicts clear weather; that is all we ever said about the rainbow. Our people never thought the northern lights were ghosts, like you say the Chippewa believe. We merely looked at them and wondered what they were.

We kept count of years by drawing a picture of the chief event of the year. Chief events that we pictured might be the death of a great man, an eclipse, a comet, a great battle, a forest fire, or an earthquake. Some took the trunk of a small tree and planed it down until it had a smooth surface, and drew pictures on that. I would like to show you my record but it was burnt when my house burnt down two years ago. I made it on the horns of mountain goat. I soaked the horns and then boiled them, and repeated this many times. After each boiling I flattened them out some more. When they were as flat as I could make them, I dried them under weights of rock. When they were dry, I fastened the head ends together. I drew a picture of each event I wanted to record. If I still had it I would show you the events by beginning at the outer edge and circling round the entire edge. Then you would keep moving round and round [clockwise] until you got close to the inside. These are some of the years that I recorded: The year that I was born Four Horns was killed; I was told this, so I marked that for the first event [on my calendar]. A priest, whose name was Father DeSmet, came to Powder River to make peace with the Sioux—he and three other men. It was the first time I saw him. I marked that. [May, 1868.]<sup>26</sup> For an entire day at one time the sun was eclipsed; so I marked it. Jumping Bull, Sitting Bull's father, was killed by the Crow; so that was another event. A Crow man, two Crow women, and one of their sons were captured and held by the Sioux; they were in a cage-like thing built of brush. Sitting

<sup>25</sup> For a variant see Hayden, *Ibid.*

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Hiram Martin Chittenden and Alfred Talbot Richardson, *Life, Letters and Travels of Father Pierre-Jen de Smet, S.J., 1801-1873*, III, 899-922, for Father de Smet's account of this visit.

Bull took them out of this and sent them home; I marked that. Another year the Sioux captured a white woman and held her captive. Sitting Bull also freed her and sent her home; so I marked that. And so on. Well, if a man wanted to speak of a certain event, say for instance the death of his father—his father being only an ordinary man—he would say: "My father died during the year of the great eclipse."

I knew our sign language and also those of the Rees [Arikaras] and the Crow, when I was twenty-five years old.<sup>27</sup> Nobody taught them to me like we teach the children today. If we wanted to talk to another tribe there was nothing for us to do but to learn the sign language of that tribe, unless we wanted to learn the language that those people spoke, and that would have taken a long time. It is not hard to learn the sign language. Most of the signs are identical. I learned the different signs by becoming acquainted with the different tribes.

If you had come here to visit sixty years ago, I would have let the men of the Council know that you were here. They would have approved of you and let you come in. That was our custom. The Sioux wanted to be friendly with the Whites. When trouble came between the Whites and the Sioux, it was usually because one of our tribe had murdered one of the members and was driven away. That was our custom, too. But what happened was this: that fellow would leave the tribe and take revenge by going over to the side of the Whites and cause trouble between them and us.

[We bade goodbye to Oscar One Bull. His friendly, kindly face was lined with resignation. And we bade farewell to his devoted wife, who waved goodbye with expressions of regret in subdued monosyllables.<sup>28</sup>]

SISTER M. INEZ HILGER

<sup>27</sup> Variations in the sign languages of the North American Indians are discussed and illustrated by Garrick Mallery, *Sign Language Among the North American Indians*. First Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1879-1880, 263-552.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. the writer's article, "Was it Father De Smet?" in *The Christian Family*, February 1944, 45, for a discussion of her baptism by Father De Smet.



# The "Recit des voyages et des decouvertes du Pere Jacques Marquette."

## PART I.

Until 1927, Father Marquette was unanimously believed to be the author of the narrative of the discovery of the Mississippi in 1673. In that year, however, Father Francis Borgia Steck questioned its authenticity in his doctoral dissertation and reached the conclusion that Marquette was not the author of the *Récit* as we have it today.

Besides this conclusion, he formulated the following hypothesis: "In its present form [the *Récit*] is in substance Jolliet's journal recast and amplified by Dablon with the aid of other sources which he had at his disposal."<sup>1</sup>

As we shall see, Father Steck's conclusion is certain, but the hypothesis for which he claims great probability is most improbable. It is a theory "which . . . involves too many assumptions to receive credence."<sup>2</sup>

This doctoral dissertation comprises an introduction of six chapters. The introduction is an irrelevant discussion of what he calls the "Northern Mystery." The first two chapters are merely a rehash of the opinions of Parkman, Margry, Lorin and others. Chapter three deals with the expedition of 1673 as a whole. In the fourth chapter, entitled "The Nature of the Expedition," Father Steck protests at length against the unanimous use of the word "discovery" to describe the voyage of 1673. His objections to this general usage seem quite pointless. Those who use the word are well aware that Cabeza de Vaca must have passed by the mouth of the Mississippi in 1528, that De Soto and his men sighted the river between the Arkansas and the St. Francis in 1541, and that Moscoso and the remnants of De Soto's army on their way to Mexico descended the Mississippi to its mouth in 1543. A discovery is not so much a matter of first sighting new lands, new coasts, new islands, new

<sup>1</sup> F. B. Steck, *The Jolliet-Marquette Expedition, 1673* (Quincy, Ill., 1928), 310.

<sup>2</sup> L. P. Kellogg, *The American Historical Review*, 33 (1928): 699.

rivers, but of making them known to the world.<sup>3</sup> In this chapter also, the attempt to prove that previous knowledge of the Mississippi was "being kept alive" under the name of Rio del Espíritu Santo is unsuccessful; for it relies on the unfounded assumption that the Rio del Espíritu Santo shown on early maps or mentioned in the narrative of Cabeza de Vaca and by the chroniclers of the De Soto expedition is the Mississippi.<sup>4</sup>

The fifth chapter discusses the question of the "Leader of the Expedition," but adds nothing new on this point. Long before 1927, quite a few historians had explicitly stated that Jolliet was the leader; and in the oldest printed version of the narrative, that of Thévenot published in 1681, the opening sentence reads as follows: "Je [Marquette] m'embarquay avec le Sieur Joliet, qui avoit esté choisi pour conduire cette entreprise."

The real contribution which this dissertation made to historical knowledge is the sixth and last chapter, in which the authenticity of the *Récit* is discussed. This chapter has been the object of much ill-advised criticism. Against Father Steck's contention that Marquette never wrote the *Récit*, one of his critics wrote as follows: "The only evidence that can be adduced in support of this theory is the undoubted fact that no manuscript of the so-called journal [the *Récit*] in the priest's handwriting is known to exist. But if all authorship were denied on such ground, what masses of prose and verse, ascribed confidently to writers dead and gone this many a year, would stand orphaned before the world."<sup>5</sup>

Father Steck's assertion that we have no autograph Marquette manuscript of the *Récit* is true enough, but this is not the only evidence. The same critic arbitrarily rejects arguments from external evidence as unconvincing and maintains that "the internal evidence quoted by Father Steck is even less conclusive."<sup>6</sup> There is some ground for this latter contention. Why he should have advanced such weak arguments from internal evidence is difficult to under-

<sup>3</sup> L. P. Kellogg, *The French Régime in Wisconsin and the Northwest* (Madison, 1925), 54, note 13.

<sup>4</sup> In a review of *El Rio del Espiritu Santo* (New York, 1945), in *The Catholic Historical Review* (April, 1946, 101), Father Steck voices his disagreement with the author of this book. I never thought that he would agree, nor for that matter, do I care whether he agrees or not. I have long been aware that evidence which disarranges his theories will not be considered, especially if it leads to a conclusion definitely rejected beforehand. For the proper answer to critics of a certain temper, see H. Thurston, *Some Inexactitudes of Mr. G. G. Coulton* (London, 1917), 26.

<sup>5</sup> A. Repplier, *Père Marquette* (Garden City, N. Y., 1929), 259.

<sup>6</sup> Repplier, *op. cit.*, 260.

stand, considering that textual analysis furnishes conclusive proof that Marquette did not write the *Récit*.

This proof will be examined in the following pages. In the first part of the present article, we shall study the various manuscripts of the *Relation* of 1677-1678 of which the *Récit des voyages et des découvertes* du P. Jacques Marquette forms an integral part; we shall also ascertain what sources were at the disposal of the author of the *Récit*; finally, we shall consider some of the arguments on which Father Steck bases his hypothesis. In the second part of this article, we shall trace, paragraph by paragraph, the sources utilized by the author of the *Récit*.

On October 25, 1678, Father Dablon, then superior of the Jesuit missions in New France, sent a letter to Father Claude Boucher, the French assistant to the general of the Jesuits, in Rome, in which he says in part: "V[otre] R[everence]e verra dans la *Relation* la continuation des Benedictions de Dieu sur les travaux de nos missionnaires, . . . J'ay ramassé autant que Jay pu tous Les memoires du Feu P. Marquette sur ses decouvertes Je Les ay mis en ordre avec toutes les rareté et curiosité de ce voyage, et L'establissement de La Mission des Illinois, J'enuoye au P. Ragueneau ce petit ouvrage qui le fera voir a V R<sup>ce</sup>."<sup>7</sup>

The relation spoken of in this letter is that for 1677-1678.<sup>8</sup> "All the memoirs [writings] of the late Father Marquette" comprised the journal of his second voyage, the map of the Mississippi River, one or more letters written to Dablon before the spring of 1673, and a small devotional treatise. By "rarities and curiosities" of the voyage of 1673, Dablon does not mean that he had found them in Marquette's writings, but refers to what he had learned about the voyage from various members of the expedition.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Dablon to Boucher, October 25, 1678, Jesuit Archives, Rome, *Gallia*, 110, I, f. 62v.

<sup>8</sup> R. G. Thwaites, ed., *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* (73 vols., Cleveland, 1896-1901), hereinafter quoted as JR, 61: 18 ff. The text printed by Thwaites is taken from the *Relations inédites de la Nouvelle-France (1672-1679)* [F. de Montézon, ed.] (2 vols., Paris, 1861), 2: 196 ff. In editing this relation Thwaites substituted two passages from the manuscript in the archives of the Collège Sainte-Marie, Montreal.

<sup>9</sup> On October 24, 1674, Dablon had written to Father Jean Pinette, the Provincial in Paris: "Le recit de ce voiage estoit plein de raretez et de curiositez tres considerables, mais celui [Jolliet] qui ns l'apportoit ayat fait noffrage proche Montreal tous ses papiers ont esté perdus."—Jesuit Archives of the Province of France, Fonds Brotier (Canada-3), f. 2.

This letter is edited in the most deplorable fashion in the *Relations inédites*, 2: 3-18. The above passage and others are omitted. Thwaites (JR, 59: 66-68) reproduced the text of the *Relations inédites*. The correct date is October 24. Dablon addressed this letter to Father Pinette, because, he did not know yet when he wrote that Father De Champs had

The main problem raised by Dablon's letter is the identification of "the little work" in which he embodied "all the memoirs of the discoveries of the late Father Marquette after setting them in order," and inserted "all the rarities and curiosities of this voyage," that is, of the voyage of 1673. In the same little work there is also an account, added by Dablon, of the establishment of the Illinois mission. Now, from the title and from the opening words of the *Relation* for 1677-1678, we know that this "little work" is the *Récit des voyages et des découvertes du Père Jacques Marquette*.<sup>10</sup>

Several copies of this *Relation* were made in Quebec and at least one was made in Paris. But of these copies, only one is complete, namely, Canada-5,<sup>11</sup> an in-8° manuscript of 68 pages numbered 1 to 67 on the recto of each page.

---

succeeded Pinette as Provincial. On the fly leaf of the *Relation* of 1674, a copyist wrote that it had been "Enuoyée Par le R. P. Claude D'Ablon . . . Au R. P. Estienne De Champs Prouincial."

Dablon's letter to Pinette was translated into Latin by Father Ragueneau, probably in view of sending a copy to Rome. This Latin translation immediately follows the French copy. With regard to this translation C. de Rochemonteix wrote: "On conserve aux Archives générales de la Compagnie de Jésus une lettre latine du P. d'Ablon, adressée le 25 octobre 1674 au R. P. Général, Paul Oliva, dans laquelle il est parlé du voyage du P. Marquette. Le double de cette lettre, de la main du P. d'Ablon, envoyé au P. Pinette, Provincial de Paris, se trouve aux Archives de la rue Lhomond, 18, Paris, cahier 3, *Canada*, 1673-1674."—*Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (3 vols., Paris, 1895-1896), 3: 10, note 3. The Latin version of the copy of Dablon's letter is not in the handwriting of the latter but in that of Ragueneau, and the difference between the handwriting of these two men is so marked that Rochemonteix' mistake on this point is difficult to understand. Compare the specimen of Ragueneau's handwriting in JR, 38, facing p. 48, with the specimens of Dablon's handwriting in JR, 47, facing p. 268, and 57, facing p. 180.

<sup>10</sup> "Pour Relation de L'année 1678 || Récit Des voyages et des Descouuertes du Pere Jacques Marquette || de la Compagnie de Jesus en l'année 1673 et autres suiuantes || Au R. P. Pierre de Verthamont Prouincial de la Compa || gnie en la Prouince de france ||  
Mon Reuerend Pere

Pax christi

Auant que de commencer ce recit je prie vostre Reuerence . . ."—Archives of the Province of France, Fonds Brotier (Canada-5), 1. Compare this title with that in the *Relations inédites* 2: 195, and in JR, 61: 18.

<sup>11</sup> The reason why this complete copy is called Canada-5 is as follows. In the archives of the Province of France this document is one of the volumes of the Fonds Brotier, a collection named after Father Gabriel Brotier, the last librarian of the Collège Louis-le-Grand. At the time of the suppression of the Society of Jesus in France in 1762, Father Brotier saved what manuscripts he could from the pillagers who descended en masse on the Jesuit libraries in France. After the restoration of the Society, these manuscripts were first housed in the École Sainte-Genève, and were sent to Canterbury, England, in 1901, to save them from further damage. In the meantime, the various bundles of manuscripts had been bound into volumes, each of which was given a number. The whole collection comprises 199 volumes. Twenty-two of these volumes contain documents concerning North America; these are numbered 155 to 176 in the collection, but they are also numbered Canada 1 to 22. Thus Canada-5 is volume 159 of the Fonds Brotier.

The first part, which we shall call A, includes pages 1-[22] and treats of all the missions of Canada. Pages 23-[24] are blank. From pages 25-[52] is found the *Récit* with its preamble. We shall refer to it as B. This part of Canada-5, which bears a separate title,<sup>12</sup> is ordinarily listed as Marquette-5. The preamble takes one and a half pages; the *Récit* proper extends from the middle of page [26] to the lowest third of page [52]. At this point begins the second chapter; that is, the narrative of Marquette's second voyage to the Illinois country and an account of his death. This second chapter, pages [52]-61 will be called C. Chapter three, pages 61-67, contains a narrative of a "third voyage to the Illinois country"; the words "par le P. Allouez" are a contemporary addition in a different hand from that of the copyist of the whole manuscript. This third chapter, which will be designated as D, consists of a letter of Father Allouez with a few lines of introduction by Father Dablon. These three chapters, B, C, D, which are of very unequal length are divided respectively into ten, three and two sections.

The whole of Canada-5 is in the same handwriting which is not that of Marquette, Dablon or Ragueneau, but probably that of a Jesuit brother in Paris.

Four fragments of the Relation for 1677-1678 are bound in one volume, Fonds Brotier 158, of 148 pages in-8°. This volume which according to our previous explanation is also designated as Canada-4, is divided as follows:

The first fragment comprises the whole of A and the first seven pages of B down to the middle of page 31 of Canada-5. This is the same as sections 1 and 2 of Marquette-5 and half of section 3. Part B of this fragment will be referred to as Marquette-4a.

The second fragment of Canada-4 begins with the last six lines of the music score of the Illinois song, that is, with the end of section 6 (pages [42]-[43]) of Marquette-5 and covers the rest of the Relation for 1677-1678, namely, the remainder of B, the whole of C and D. Part B of this fragment will be designated as Marquette-4b. The handwriting of this second fragment is not the same as that of the first and differs from the handwriting of Marquette-5.

With regard to the date of these fragments, Father Hamy argues from the spelling that they were posterior to 1678.<sup>13</sup> This argument has no value whatever. Copyists were not in the least concerned to reproduce the original exactly; each one followed his own

<sup>12</sup> *Recit || Des voyages et des Descouertes du Pere || Jacques Marquette de la Compagnie de Jesus || en 1673 et autres. ||*

<sup>13</sup> A. Hamy, *Au Mississipi* (Paris, 1903), 223.



fancy with regard to spelling, punctuation, capitalization and abbreviations. As a matter of fact, Marquette-5 is posterior to both these fragments as can be seen by examining the titles of the various sections. In Marquette-5 these titles are shorter and contained abbreviations whereas in the fragments they are written out in full. Moreover, as we shall see, Marquette-5 was made in Paris on a copy sent from Quebec, where the complete copies of the Relation for 1677-1678 were made, of which the two fragments are all that remains.

The third fragment contains the first sixteen pages of A, down to the end of the relation of the Lorette mission. The handwriting resembles that of the second fragment.

The fourth fragment covers the beginning and the end of D, that is the narrative of Allouez' voyage to the Illinois country. The handwriting resembles that of the first fragment.

As can be seen, the contents of this volume, Canada-4, are very disparate; these fragments were bound together in the middle of the nineteenth century by someone who evidently had not read them.

Another copy of the *Récit* in the archives of the Collège Sainte-Marie, Montreal, has the following title: *Recit || Des Voyages Et des Découvertes || du P. Jacques Marquette || De la Compagnie de Jesvs, En l'année 1673 Et aux suiuanes.* || Besides B, it contains C and D. Originally written in 1678, it was recopied in 1679; and was proofread by Dablon, who added at the end of the second section of the third chapter a paragraph saying that Allouez had returned to the Illinois country in 1679. This Montreal manuscript as it exists today is mutilated:—two of the original leaves were lost and their place taken by pages from the Thévenot printed version.

The accompanying table summarizes the contents of all these manuscripts.

The existence of these various copies of the Relation for 1677-1678 and the differences between them can be accounted for as follows. When the copy or copies of Dablon's original relation reached Paris at the beginning of 1679, Ragueneau had another copy made which he sent to Rome.<sup>14</sup> This is Canada-5, which contains Marquette-5. Fathers de Montézon, Hamy, Rochemonteix and others call it the Roman manuscript, because it was in Rome until the middle of the nineteenth century when it was brought to Paris.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *supra*, note 7, Dablon's letter to Boucher: "I am sending this little work to Father Ragueneau, who will show it to your Reverence." According to the same letter, Ragueneau did not have to send A, but only B, C and D: "Your Reverence will see in the Relation that God continues to bless the labors of our missionaries . . ."

## THE RECIT MANUSCRIPTS

BROTHER 159 (CANADA 5)	BROTHER 159 (CANADA 4)				MONTREAL
	First Fragment	Second Fragment	Third Fragment	Fourth Fragment	
A Pages 1 - [22] All missions			First sixteen pages		
B 10 Sections pages 25 - [52] Marquette's Voyage of 1673 - <u>Récit</u> (Marquette 5)	Sections 1, 2, and half of section 3.	Last 6 lines of section 6; sections 7, 8, 9, 10. (Marquette-4a)(Marquette-4b)			The 10 sections, minus 2 leaves
C 3 Sections pages [52]-61 Marquette's Voyage to the Illinois Country 1674 - 1676 His death, 1676					The 3 Sections
D 2 Sections pages 61 - 67 Voyage of Allouez to the Illinois Country 1676-1677				The beginning and end	The 2 Sections  Dablon's additional paragraph

The four fragments in Canada-4 are evidence that there was more than one copy in Paris in 1679; and Thévenot's published version of the *Récit* must have been based ultimately on one of these Paris copies.<sup>15</sup>

Thévenot's published version of the *Récit* has been severely criticized since Shea's publication of the Montreal manuscript. Such criticism is unjustified, for Thévenot's text is not essentially different from the manuscript published by Shea. Father Steck in particular carries his search for "problems" and "puzzles" to a point of looking for *midi à quatorze heures*. The twenty pages in which he discusses the "problem" of "how this manuscript came into the hands of Thévenot"; in which he is "puzzled" over alterations, omissions, substitutions and transpositions in the Thévenot text when compared with that of the Montreal manuscript are a complete waste of time, ink and paper. The question is not what Thévenot should have done, but what he did. Father Steck might conceivably have edited the manuscript differently, but that is another story. Thévenot used the liberty which publishers took, and still take today, with manuscripts submitted for publication; and the result is a published text which is much better than the text of many of the letters and narratives dealing with the exploration of the Mississippi Valley which Margry issued two centuries later. Father Steck has no more reason for wondering whether Thévenot had a manuscript different from those listed above, than one would have for questioning whether Margry had documents different from those which are now in the national archives in Paris.

Thévenot did not obtain his copy of the *Récit* from Cramoisy or from Michallet as Father Steck suggests, but from the Paris Jesuits with whom he was friendly and who also supplied him with letters and relations of their missionaries in China. Together with a copy of the *Récit*, they gave him the manuscript map which Liébaux engraved.

The number of textual variants, greater than 300, as Father Steck rightly remarks, is much less impressive than he would have us believe. The forty-five variants which he selected for purpose of detailed comparison are really insignificant in view of the following considerations.

First, the copy given to Thévenot was made on a copy of a copy. Secondly, the nonchalance of seventeenth century copyists is evident to anyone who has taken the trouble of mutually collating the various

<sup>15</sup> M. Thévenot, ed., *Recueil de voyages de Mr Thevenot* (Paris, 1681), 1-43.



copies of an extant original. Thirdly, Thévenot himself further edited this copy which he had received, and we have no means of knowing how faithfully the printer reproduced his editorial changes. Fourthly, one should not lose sight of the fact that the original was written by Dablon after more than twenty years in Canada, and some of the changes undoubtedly improve the style of the narrative. Finally, it is worth noting that Thévenot did not publish his *Récit* until the death of Ragueneau which occurred in Paris on September 3, 1680. Had Ragueneau been alive at the time of publication, it is doubtful whether Thévenot would have edited the text so freely.

The Montreal manuscript, first published by Shea in 1852,<sup>16</sup> was re-issued by De Montézon in 1861;<sup>17</sup> and in 1903 Marquette-5 was published by Father Hamy.<sup>18</sup> The bibliographical note prefaced to this latter publication contains some errors that should be corrected.

First, Hamy quite mistakenly calls the *Récit* Marquette's Journal of the voyage of 1673. Secondly, he says that there are four known copies of this "Journal": one at Harvard, one in Montreal, and two in the Archives of the École Sainte-Geneviève, Paris.

The Harvard manuscript, he says, is an authenticated copy of the autograph. This is not true. There is no manuscript of the *Récit* at Harvard, and anything like an authenticated copy of the autograph would be quite impossible, for no autograph exists anywhere. How little acquainted Father Hamy was with this "Harvard manuscript" is clear from his next statement. After noting that there is no indication whether this Harvard copy deals with the first or with the second voyage, Hamy says that Thévenot made use of it, and calmly concludes: "It is [a copy of the 'Journal' of] the first voyage."<sup>19</sup>

He also says that the Montreal manuscript was made "by or for" Father Dablon. If he had ever looked at the Montreal manuscript, he would have seen at a glance that it is not in Dablon's handwriting.

Hamy's third manuscript is thus described: "Father Dablon's copy (Recueil n° 5 in the archives of the École Sainte-Geneviève, Paris [*i. e.*, Marquette-5], is in the Relation de la Nouvelle-France for the year 1678 [namely, Canada-5]. It is in the handwriting of Father Dablon and is addressed to Reverend Father de Verthamont."

<sup>16</sup> J. G. Shea, *Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley* (Redfield, 1852), 231-257. For other printings of the document by Shea, see, JR, 59: 298 f.

<sup>17</sup> *Relations inédites*, 2: 241-289.

<sup>18</sup> *Au Mississippi*, 224-255.

<sup>19</sup> Hamy's mistake seems to have arisen from his misunderstanding of the footnote on p. xxxiv of Shea's *Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley*.

This statement is another proof that Hamy never saw a specimen of Dablon's handwriting. It also indicates that he did not compare the handwriting of Marquette-5 with the latin translation of Dablon's letter of October 25, 1674, which was then in the archives of the École Sainte-Geneviève, and which Hamy says is also in Dablon's handwriting.

About the fourth copy he remarks: "The last copy in a different handwriting from the third is also in the archives of the École Sainte-Geneviève." This is Marquette-4. "Father de Rochemonteix says that the narrative of Marquette's first voyage dated August 1, 1674, is in the archives of the Society of Jesus in Rome and is reproduced (from the manuscript no. 4 of the École Sainte-Geneviève) in the *Relations inédites* [1: 193-204]." This is another inaccuracy. Dablon's letter of August 1, 1674, is not in Canada-4, but in Canada-1. Rochemonteix supposed that the manuscript was in Rome because of a statement at the end of De Montézon's foreword to Dablon's letter: "This document is found only in the Roman collection."<sup>20</sup>

A final mistake appears in the following statement: "Elsewhere he [Rochemonteix] says<sup>21</sup> that he collated Father Dablon's copy [the Montreal manuscript] as printed [by Shea] in New York in 1855 with the Rome original manuscript." What Rochemonteix actually did was to collate Shea's edition of the Montreal manuscript with Marquette-5, and to note the variants between the two copies. "Unfortunately," says Father Hamy, "we do not know where the Rome original is. It is not among what is left of the archives of the Society of Jesus in the hands of the Italian government, nor in public depositories, nor in the best known private collections."<sup>22</sup>

All the confusion about these manuscripts has arisen from the fact that those who attempted to describe them overlooked an important detail:—the manuscripts which Father de Montézon says are in the Rome collections<sup>23</sup> were there until the middle of last century and at that time they were brought to Paris.

Father Hamy ends his introductory note by saying that his transcription of Marquette-5 is a faithful one, "that is, a transcription which is called diplomatic, except that the accents have been marked on the last syllable, whether or not it is followed by a mute vowel."

<sup>20</sup> *Relations inédites*, 1: 192.

<sup>21</sup> *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France*, 3: 10, note 3.

<sup>22</sup> Hamy, *Au Mississipi*, 223.

<sup>23</sup> *Relations inédites*, 1: 2, 192; 2: 98, 195, 240.

Hamy's publication cannot be called a diplomatic edition, for such an edition simply reproduces all manuscript readings, without indicating any preference, but giving exact references to each. In Hamy's first paragraph of the *Récit*, there are variants taken from Marquette-4 and from Shea's edition of the Montreal manuscript without any reference to the sources of these variants.

We must insist on the fact that the variants in these different copies of the *Récit* do not affect the substance of the contents. The copies sent to France were made in Quebec on Dablon's original, and Marquette-5 was made on one of these copies. Although Marquette-5 is the only complete copy, we shall use the Montreal text in the second part of this article, because this text was corrected by Dablon. The two missing leaves in the Montreal manuscript will be supplied from Marquette-5, and as occasion arises, we shall call attention to important variants in the different texts.

Since there is no doubt that Dablon wrote the *Relation* for 1677-1678, of which the *Récit* is an integral part (*Avant que de commencer ce récit*), our main problem is to ascertain what material he had at hand for composing the *Récit* in 1678.

First, he certainly had his own letter of August 1, 1674, for in the *Récit* there are passages taken word for word from this letter. It is incredible that Dablon should use the same terms after a four year interval, or that these passages should have been identically expressed by Marquette in his journal written during the voyage down the Mississippi in 1673.

Secondly, Dablon had a copy of Jolliet's map as well as a copy of Jolliet's dedicatory letter to Frontenac which today is inscribed on a copy of this map. Furthermore, it is not only probable but quite certain that Dablon had further talks with Jolliet between July 1674 and the autumn of 1678, when the *Récit* was written. Both were living in the same small village,<sup>24</sup> and there is not the slightest evidence to support Father Steck's contention that Jolliet did not remain friendly with the Jesuits after his return from his voyage of discovery<sup>25</sup> or after 1682, when Thévenot's *Recueil* may

<sup>24</sup> In 1681, the population of Quebec was 1,345 persons. B. Sulte, *Histoire des Canadiens-Français* (8 vols., Montreal, 1882-1884), 5: 88.

<sup>25</sup> See "Louis Jolliet. The Middle Years, 1674-1686," *MID-AMERICA*, 27 (1945): 75-78.—Since this article was written, I have had occasion to consult the *Registre des baptêmes, mariages et sépultures des sauvages du Lac St Jean, Chicoutimi, et Tadoussac de 1669 à 1692*, which is known as the "deuxième registre de Tadoussac," (see "The Voyage of Louis Jolliet to Hudson Bay in 1679," *MID-AMERICA*, 26 [1944]: 245, note 1). In this register, folio 61v, under the year 1679 is the following entry: "Ceste année Messrs de la Chesnay et Bo[i]sseau ont employé Msr Jolliet—son frere Zacharie [.] Guill[aume] Bissot. Estienne Lesart—Louys le

have reached Canada.<sup>26</sup> And Dablon certainly questioned Jacques Largilier who had taken part in the expedition and who after his return to Quebec in 1675, became a Jesuit *donné* and was again in Quebec in 1676. It is probable that Dablon also interviewed Thiberge and Plattier, two other members of the expedition, who returned to Quebec in 1674, but we have no written evidence that he did so.

Thirdly, Dablon had Marquette's map, and from Dablon's autograph note on the fly leaf of Marquette's journal of his second voyage to the Illinois country, we know that he also had this journal.

Finally, if Dablon did not have at his disposal in Quebec a complete set of the Jesuit Relations, he certainly had those which had been published since his arrival in Canada in 1655, in particular those which he himself had edited and the manuscript of those written since the publication of the Relations had been suspended.

There is no essential fact concerning the voyage of 1673 in the *Récit* that cannot be traced to these written or oral sources. The dependence of the *Récit* on the written sources can be established with certainty. As for those parts of the text for which we have no written sources, they will be seen to depend on the oral testimony of Jolliet and Largilier and in the case of one or two items, on a lost account of the voyage.

Before presenting evidence for the sources of the *Récit*, we must at once dispose of the objection that the parts for which we have no written sources may have been taken by Dablon from Marquette's journal of his first voyage. If this were true, Dablon would not have written to Boucher that he had gathered all writings of the late Father Marquette to the best of his ability. Instead, he would have mentioned Marquette's journal. His failure to mention Marquette's journal of the second voyage does not at all indicate that he would have failed to mention the journal of the first if he had possessed it.

We know that he was intensely interested in the geography of North America, and that he collected all possible data which would make the continent better known. We also know that he directed his subordinates to compute latitudes whenever they could do so.

Mieux—pierre son frere [,] pierre Lesart—pierre Le grand—Denys—pour establir la Traitte et la Mission de St François Xavier á Nemiskau par le p. Antoine Silvy [,] Le R. p. Claude Dablon estant Superieur de toutes les Missions [,] Conducteurs Jacq<sup>s</sup> Kakachabeu et Sani<sup>s</sup> [or Sari<sup>s</sup>].

<sup>26</sup> "Le R. P. André [Father Louis André] avec Mr. Jolliet au Ka<sup>s</sup> et Anticosti pendant lesté." Second register of Tadoussac, entry for the year 1684, fo. 54v.

That latitudes were computed during the voyage of 1673 is certain. We know this from the fact that in July 1673, Jolliet told Dablon the position of the mouth of the Wisconsin, the mouth of the Missouri and the terminus of the expedition.<sup>27</sup> We also know that they computed latitudes from Marquette's letter of August 4, 1673;<sup>28</sup> and we know that two other latitudes were entered in Marquette's journal of the voyage: the latitude of the mouth of the Ohio and that of the terminus of the expedition.<sup>29</sup> These two latitudes are at variance with those given in the *Récit* because Dablon took them not from Marquette's journal but from Marquette's map. Now it is unbelievable that he should have relied on the map for this information, if he had in his possession Marquette's journal in which the exact latitudes were entered.

Since Father Steck chose to deny that there ever was a Marquette journal of the first voyage down the Mississippi, we must examine on what grounds he bases his denial and evaluate his arguments. As a necessary preliminary to this discussion we must call attention to the opening paragraph of Marquette's autograph journal of his second voyage to the Illinois country.

Ayant este contraint de demeurer a st. Francois tout l'esté, a cause de quelque incommode, en ayant este guery dez le mois de septembre, l'y attendois l'arriuee de nos gens au retour de la bas pour sçauoir ceque ie ferois pour mon hyuernement; lesquels m'en apportèrent les ordres pour mon uoyage a la mission de la Conception des Illinois, ayant satisfait aux sentiments de V. R pour les coppies de mon iournal touchant la Riuiere de missisipi, Je partis avec Pierre Porteret et Iacque [Largilier] le 25 oct 1674 sur les midy<sup>30</sup>

The full import of this opening paragraph can be grasped only if we take into account the facts of which we are certain from collateral evidence, and if we pay attention to the obvious meaning of the evidence instead of being guided by what one "prefers to think" this meaning is. The relevant facts are as follows:

To reach Montreal sometime before July 6, 1674, Jolliet must have left Sault Ste Marie at the end of May or at the latest at the beginning of June. We know that he was still in Montreal on July 13, and that he had left this town a week later.<sup>31</sup> Hence he

<sup>27</sup> "The 1674 Account of the Discovery of the Mississippi," *MID-AMERICA*, 26 (1944): 317, 318, 319.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. "Marquette's Autograph Map of the Mississippi River," *MID-AMERICA*, 27 (1945): 51.

<sup>29</sup> JR, 65: 106, 116; "Marquette's Autograph Map," *loc. cit.*, 44, 48.

<sup>30</sup> JR, 59: 164.

<sup>31</sup> "Louis Jolliet. Early Years, 1645-1674," *MID-AMERICA*, 27 (1945): 19, 24.



arrived at Quebec during the last third of the month of July, for the voyage from Montreal to Quebec was a matter of three or four days at the most. The date of Jolliet's arrival at Quebec is confirmed by the date of Dablon's letter, August 1, 1674, in which the Jesuit superior set down what he had heard from the explorer. A reading of the Relation for 1673-1674 makes it clear that Dablon wrote down the interview immediately and finished the Relation several months later. In his letter of August 1, Dablon wrote: "Father Marquette has kept a copy of that [relation] which has been lost." Meanwhile and until "the journal of this voyage" is forthcoming, he contented himself with mentioning the general advantages of this discovery which he had learned from Jolliet.<sup>32</sup>

Any difficulties that might arise from Dablon's reference to the "copy of the relation—or journal—which has been lost," are disposed of by Marquette's own words quoted above: "Having deferred to the wishes of Your Reverence for the copies of MY JOURNAL concerning the Mississippi River." This means that Marquette had complied with Dablon's request, which he received sometime in October 1674. As we have seen, Dablon wrote to Pinette on October 25, 1674: "Le recit de ce voiage estoit plein de raretez et de curiositez tres considerables, mais celuy [Jolliet] qui ns l'apportoit aya<sup>t</sup>. fait nofrage proche montreal tous ses papiers ont esté perdus, J'en attend un au. exemplaire lan qui vient que iay demandé au p. Marquette qui en a gardé copie."<sup>33</sup>

It should be noticed that Marquette does not speak of Jolliet's journal but of his own. It is pointless to ask, as Father Steck does, whether upon receiving Dablon's request, Marquette "understood his superior correctly." No matter how Dablon may have worded his request to Marquette for a copy of the lost journal, the latter clearly and unmistakably says that he has made copies of his own journal of the voyage for Dablon. It is absurd to say that Marquette is not "clear and precise in stating what sort of papers he was transmitting to his Superior." Father Steck suggests how Marquette might have ensured greater clarity: "had he said 'I am sending to Your Reverence my journal,' then there could be no doubt as to what Dablon actually received."<sup>34</sup> Doubtless Marquette would have anticipated this suggestion if it accurately expressed what he was doing. The fact that he does not speak explicitly of

<sup>32</sup> "The 1674 Account of the Discovery of the Mississippi," *loc. cit.*, 320.

<sup>33</sup> Dablon to Pinette, October 24, 1674, Jesuit Archives of the Province of France, Fonds Brotier (Canada-3), f. 1v.

<sup>34</sup> *The Jolliet-Marquette Expedition*, 290 f.

sending his journal would seem to indicate that he was not actually sending it at the time he wrote. In any case, his silence on this point should not discredit his explicit statement that he made or that he had copies of HIS journal made.

Elsewhere we are told that at Green Bay Marquette

was disconcerted when . . . he received instructions to send the journal he had written of the expedition to the Mississippi. He had no journal, illness having all year prevented him from composing one. What he had, however, were the notes he had taken during the expedition as also the copies of Jolliet's journal. Eager to open a regular mission among the Illinois and realizing that it was already the middle of October, Marquette decided to send what he had. He felt sure that, considering the circumstances, his Superior would be satisfied. He would explain later and for that reason wrote in the opening paragraph of his Journal of the second voyage: "Having satisfied the wishes of your Reverence for the copies of my journal concerning the river of Mississippi, I departed . . . on October 25, 1674, about noon."<sup>35</sup>

We have quoted at length from this paragraph in order not to misrepresent Father Steck's position. He declares unequivocally that Marquette had no journal, all that he had were personal notes and copies of Jolliet's journal. Not only does this statement need to be supported by evidence, but it is also incumbent on Father Steck to explain how Marquette's words "MON journal" mean that he had "no journal," but only "notes taken during the expedition." In another passage of this dissertation Father Steck's attitude toward a similar reference is altogether different and exemplifies his arbitrariness in dealing with documentary evidence. "What Jolliet meant when he spoke of 'my journal' is clear. It was an account of the expedition, the main topic discussed by him on August 1."<sup>36</sup> For some odd reason when Marquette speaks of "my journal," it is no longer clear, nor precise. What Marquette means is Jolliet's journal, or notes taken during the expedition. He means everything except "my journal."

Even if we did not have the word of Marquette that he had a journal, we know that twenty-seven years later Gravier took Marquette's journal with him in his voyage down the Mississippi. And quite apart from this direct evidence, we should be justified in presuming that he kept a journal on the first voyage from the fact that we have an autograph journal—not merely "notes" or somebody else's journal—of his second, much less important, voyage to the Illi-

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 206 f.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 290.

nois country; a journal which was kept under much more adverse conditions. Moreover, Dablon was too much interested in the great river of the West not to have recommended keeping such a journal when he ordered Marquette, in 1672, to accompany Jolliet.

The statement that illness prevented Marquette from "composing" a journal is sheer conjecture. There is no reason to suppose that such composition was necessary, for we know that the journal of the second voyage was certainly not "composed" after, but during the journey itself. When one speaks of a journal, one means day by day entries, or entries on those days when notable events occur. This, however, does not exclude the case of the author of a journal making a neat copy of it at a later date.<sup>37</sup> It would not have taken "all year" to make copies of the journal of the expedition. Moreover, Marquette was not ill "all year" at Green Bay. His illness began toward the end of May 1674, and ended in September. He would then have had plenty of time during the seven months between his return from the Mississippi and the month of May to "compose" a journal, if there had been any need of such "composition."

Jolliet told Dablon that Marquette had kept a copy of the lost journal, and he told Frontenac that copies of it were at Sault Ste Marie, "chez les Pères," that is, with the Jesuits there. Dablon wrote in his letter of August 1, 1674, that he would be able to give a complete account of the voyage down the Mississippi "next year" when the copy mentioned by Jolliet would be available; and Frontenac wrote to Colbert in November 1674 that the copies at Sault Ste Marie could not be brought to Quebec until next year.

There is no evidence that the governor actually gave orders to send these copies to Quebec, or that Jolliet himself wrote for them; in any event, these copies had gone up in flames by the time word might have reached Sault Ste Marie. On the other hand, we have seen that Dablon wrote to Marquette asking for the copy of the lost journal, and Marquette answered that he had made copies of his own journal.

There is no mystery connected with the manner in which Dablon communicated with Marquette. Dablon knew of the lost journal before August 1. Convoys usually left Quebec for the West at the beginning of August, and left Montreal toward the middle of the

<sup>37</sup> Jolliet, for instance, recopied in Quebec the journal of his voyage to Labrador in 1694. "Last Voyages and Death of Louis Jolliet," *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec (RAPQ) pour 1943-1944* (Quebec, 1944), 170, note 12.

month. It took five weeks to make the journey from Montreal to Michilimackinac or Sault Ste Marie. For all that Dablon knew, Marquette had returned to Michilimackinac the preceding spring or early in the summer.

Dablon's request for the copy of Jolliet's journal, then, must have arrived at Michilimackinac in the latter part of September 1674. Marquette was not there at the time, for he "had been forced to remain at St. François [Green Bay] the whole summer on account of illness." This illness began at the end of May and lasted until September.<sup>38</sup> Marquette then wrote to the local superior, Father Nouvel, for further orders. In the introductory paragraph of the journal of his second voyage, he says that he had been waiting at the St. Francis Xavier mission since September, "for the return of our men from up there (*la bas*) to learn what I would do during the winter. They brought me orders from up there to proceed to the mission of the Conception among the Illinois . . . I departed with Pierre Porteret and Jacques [Largilier] on October 25, 1674, toward noon."

It is clear from this that in September 1674, Marquette had written to Father Nouvel who was then at Michilimackinac or at Sault Ste Marie (*la bas*), to know what he should do during the winter, and "our men" brought orders to him (*m'en*) from *la bas*, that is, from Father Nouvel who as superior of the western missions had to assign the missionaries to their various posts. That the expression *la bas* means Michilimackinac or Sault Ste Marie and not Quebec is clear from a letter of Father Cholenec:

The Reverend Father Superior of the Ottawa missions [Nouvel] gave him leave to go [to the Illinois country], and for this purpose, a week after Michaelmas, sent from Michilimackinac where he ordinarily resides two of our servants [Largilier and Porteret], one of whom [Largilier] had made the journey [down the Mississippi] with him. They went to the Baye des Puans [St. Francis Xavier mission], where he was, whence he left with them at the beginning of November.<sup>39</sup>

On the basis of these data, we argue as follows. When the convoy from Quebec arrived at either Michilimackinac or Sault Ste Marie toward the end of September, Largilier and Porteret were

<sup>38</sup> Lettre circulaire [obituary] du P. Jacques Marquette, October 13, 1675. Jesuit Archives, Rome, *Gallia*, 110, II, f. 195.

<sup>39</sup> Cholenec to Fontenay, October 10, 1675, in Rochemonteix, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France*, 3: 607.

there; for they had come to Nouvel with Marquette's letter asking permission to winter among the Illinois. One week (*huit jours*) after Michaelmass, that is, during the first week of October, these messengers departed on their return journey to Marquette, bringing with them Nouvel's permission. They must also have taken with them Dablon's request for copies of Marquette's journal which had arrived from Quebec with the convoy. The return journey by canoe to the St. Francis Xavier mission took a week's time; hence they would have reached Marquette at the mission before the middle of October. We know from Marquette's journal of his second voyage that he left with them for the Illinois country on October 25. The interval of more than a week between the arrival at St. Francis Xavier of Largilier and Porteret and Marquette's departure with them on October 25 would have allowed him ample time "to defer to the wishes of your Reverence for copies of my journal concerning the Mississippi River."

Whether any of these copies ever left Green Bay or whether one of them reached Nouvel cannot be ascertained. It is certain that no copy ever reached Dablon. We know that Nouvel sent to Dablon the journal of the second voyage, and it is hardly probable that he would have failed to send the journal of the first, knowing that Dablon had specifically asked for it. Even supposing that copies of the first journal had reached Nouvel, it is a long way from Michilimackinac to Quebec. As can be gathered from his letters to Boucher (I have gathered to the best of my ability all the writings of the late Father Marquette), Dablon made further inquiries for this journal between the summer of 1675, the earliest date when the copies spoken of by Marquette could have been brought to Quebec, and 1678, when the *Récit* was written. By 1678, Dablon had given up hope of ever receiving this important document, and wrote the *Récit* on the basis of what he had. At this date, though he did not know it, the original or one of the copies of this journal was still extant, for Gravier had it with him on his voyage down the Mississippi in 1700.

As for the copies of Jolliet's journal which he had left at Sault Ste Marie, none of them ever reached Quebec. Soon after Jolliet's departure from the Sault, a delegation of Sioux arrived at the mission to make peace with the Saulteux. The Cree and Missisauga Indians, who had had to suffer at the hands of the Sioux, also came to the mission, firmly determined to prevent peace from being con-



cluded. Although precautions were taken lest armed Indians should gain entrance to the Jesuit house where Saulteux and Sioux were palavering, some Indians succeeded in slipping in with knives. A Cree Indian started the brawl by stabbing one of the Sioux. The latter barricaded themselves in the house and held off Saulteux, Cree and Missisauga with gunfire. Some braves, however, managed to pile up straw and bark canoes against the houses and set them on fire; "and in spite of all that could be done, it soon consumed the whole edifice, and placed the new chapel not far away in great jeopardy of being also burned. Our people did so well that they saved it."<sup>40</sup>

According to a letter of Frontenac to Colbert in November 1674, Jolliet had left "copies of journals *chez les pères*," that is, in this Jesuit house at Sault Ste Marie. As Miss Kellogg says: "A strange fatality seems to have attended the records of Jolliet. Hardly had he departed from the Sault, when the mission house and all its contents were burned. Thus the second version of his journal perished by fire, as had the first by water."<sup>41</sup>

Father Steck commented on this passage as follows: "This theory could be accepted as most probably correct, if it were certain that Jolliet stopped at Sault Sainte-Marie, that he left copies there, and that the fire occurred after he departed."<sup>42</sup>

That all these points are certain, an investigation of the evidence would have shown. In the first place, it is certain that Jolliet stopped at Sault Ste Marie. He went to the Sault because he and his associates had their business there. Father Steck says: "It is more probable and therefore generally assumed that Jolliet returned to Quebec over the Great Lakes route, not over that of the Ottawa River." Even if this is "generally assumed," it is by no means "more probable"; for there is conclusive evidence against it. Two texts show clearly that Jolliet actually returned to Quebec by way of the Ottawa River:—Dablon's letter of August 1, 1674, declares that Jolliet negotiated "more than forty rapids," and Jolliet's dedicatory letter to Frontenac speaks of "forty-two rapids" along his route from the West to Montreal. These forty rapids were certainly not along the Great Lakes route, but along the Ottawa River route.

Another of Father Steck's conjectures on this point is as follows:

<sup>40</sup> JR, 58: 256-260. Compare the account in the Relation with the version of the incident in Frontenac's letter to Colbert, November 14, 1674, RAPQ, 1927, 77 f.

<sup>41</sup> L. P. Kellogg, *The French Régime in Wisconsin*, 198.

<sup>42</sup> *The Jolliet-Marquette Expedition*, 291 f.

"Nor is there any reason to suppose that, on reaching Marquette's mission of St. Ignace, he first proceeded north to the Sault. One prefers to think that, having stopped for a day or so at St. Ignace, he crossed the strait and from what is now the town of Mackinaw continued southward along the shores of Lake Huron." That is to say, "one prefers to think" that Jolliet arriving at St. Ignace after an absence of six months, and being then only some eighty miles away from his business headquarters, neglected his business, and went aimlessly wandering "southward along the shores of Lake Huron." Jolliet certainly passed through St. Ignace, but there is no evidence of his having "stopped for a day or so" there.

The second fact, namely, that Jolliet left copies of his journal at Sault Ste Marie is attested by Frontenac in his letter to Colbert. For some obscure reason, Father Steck questions this evidence: "It is very probable, however, that in this matter as in another, Frontenac misunderstood Jolliet when the latter told him in a general way of his having left copies of the lost papers with the Jesuits." There is not one shred of evidence for saying that Jolliet told Frontenac "in a general way of his having left copies of the lost papers with the Jesuits." Frontenac's letter contains Jolliet's precise statement that he left copies of his journal with the Jesuits at Sault Ste Marie.

Neither is there any reason to suppose that Frontenac misunderstood Jolliet's statement "in this matter as in another"; for in that other matter there was no misunderstanding on Frontenac's part. Father Steck himself misunderstood Frontenac's letter to Colbert, else he would not have adopted Winsor's account after having referred to the letter itself.<sup>43</sup>

#### Winsor

He [Jolliet] urged . . . that a settlement should be formed near that cataract [Niagara], and that a vessel built on Lake Erie, which he thought in ten days could reach the gulf.<sup>44</sup>

#### Steck

From the explorer's report the governor concluded that a vessel built on Lake Erie could reach the Gulf of Mexico in ten days.

Frontenac's words are as follows: "He [Jolliet] went within ten

<sup>43</sup> P. Margry, ed., *Découvertes et Établissements des Français dans l'Ouest et dans le Sud de l'Amérique Septentrionale*, (6 vols., Paris, 1876-1888), 1: 258.

<sup>44</sup> J. Winsor, *Cartier to Frontenac* (Boston and New York, 1894), 247.

days' journey of the Gulf of Mexico." This shows that the governor did not misunderstand the explorer in this "other matter."

Further doubt is cast on Frontenac's mention of copies of Jolliet's journal at Sault Ste Marie in the following: "At all events, against the statement of Frontenac are those of Dablon and Jolliet. The Jesuit Superior declared that the copies had been left with Marquette. If this statement was wrong, that is, if the copies had been left at the Sault, Jolliet would undoubtedly have corrected the error when he transcribed Dablon's Relation and sent it with a supplementary letter of his own to Bishop Laval." Father Steck seems to have overlooked the fact that the statement of Frontenac and of Dablon came from Jolliet himself, and that none of these supposedly contrary statements is at variance with one another. We have already proved that when Jolliet parted company with Marquette at Green Bay, the latter had a journal of his own, and that Jolliet had left copies of a journal at Sault Ste Marie, "chez les pères." As for the assertion that "Jolliet would have undoubtedly corrected the error when he transcribed Dablon's relation," it is based on the false assumption that Jolliet transcribed this relation.<sup>45</sup>

Father Steck's conclusion "so the copies of Jolliet's papers were in the hands of Marquette," is likewise unsupported by evidence. After noting the irrelevant fact that Marquette did not go to Sault Ste Marie between the end of September 1673 and October 25, 1674, the paragraph which we have discussed ends with the following astounding statement: "From the documentary evidence it is certain, then, that the copies of which Dablon and Jolliet spoke were in the hands of Marquette at Green Bay." All that the documentary evidence goes to show is that Jolliet left copies of his journal at Sault Ste Marie, and that Marquette made copies of his own journal at Green Bay between October 15 and October 25, 1674. If this evidence proves anything with certainty, it proves something quite different from what Father Steck says.

That the burning of the Jesuit house at Sault Ste Marie occurred after the departure of Jolliet is clear from the fact that he made no mention of it when he reached Quebec, and from what he told Frontenac of having left copies of his journal in that house. Why Father Steck should consider this relevant is not so clear; for if Frontenac had indeed misunderstood Jolliet, the fire could not have destroyed

<sup>45</sup> "The 1674 Account of the Discovery of the Mississippi," *loc. cit.*, 309-312.

copies of a journal which existed only in Frontenac's misunderstanding.

Father Steck deserves credit for having clearly seen that Marquette was not the author of the *Récit*. His strange mishandling of the evidence, which is particularly surprising in a doctoral dissertation, was apparently due to his mistaken belief that in order to write the *Récit*, Dablon must have had a journal of Jolliet.

The actual sources from which Dablon compiled his *Récit* will be studied in the second part of this article.

(To be concluded)

JEAN DELANGLEZ

Institute of Jesuit History  
Loyola University

## Notes and Comments

Although there was during the stress of war a notable diminution of printing and shortage of scholarly works, still a number of enlightening books have appeared. Many of these have the West as their background. *Shepherds Empire*, by Charles Wayland Towne and Edward Norris Wentworth, published by the University of Oklahoma Press last year, tells the story of the sheep industry from the opening of America almost to the present. The early Spanish missionaries of Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and California really laid the foundations of the industry in the limits of the present United States. The mission flocks and the production of mutton and wool passed into the hands of Spanish and American colonists, and grew by bounds with the coming of the gold seekers and the advance of the rails. The book gives its message simply, effectively, and with an enlivening humor. There is much drama in the Indian raids, the great drives, the wars between cattlemen and sheepmen, and in the continuous struggle for the life of the industry.

\* \* \* \*

*The Trail to California: The Overland Journal of Vincent Geiger and Wakeman Bryarly*, edited with an introduction by David Morris Potter, was published by Yale University Press, 1945. In this volume Professor Potter gives not only the diary of two men going to California during the rush of 1849 but also comments and explanations based upon the study of thirty-three other diaries of the same year. The result is a wealth of detail on the great migration westward. Moreover, since the two diarists were in the employ of the Charlestown, Virginia, Mining Company, we find much information about the operation costs of this type of collectivist organization.

\* \* \* \*

*Via Western Express and Stagecoach*, by Oscar Osburn Winther, published by Stanford University Press, 1945, is confessedly an extension of an earlier work by Professor Winther and gives the "more human, and picturesque aspects of overland transportation." There is much color, as always, in the descriptions of the bandits, stagecoach drivers, the pony express, and the struggle for control of the mail-carrying business by rival companies.



*Hallowed Were the Gold Dust Trails*, by Henry L. Walsh, S.J., published by the University of Santa Clara Press, 1946, is the story of the pioneer priests of Northern California. Father Walsh has the flavor of California well preserved in this volume, and it is well that he finally accomplished his long task now when a change is coming over the spirit of the great western state with the inrush of an industrial society. His narrative of the struggles of the early Catholic missionaries, parish priests, and bishops is told in a colorful and even poetic style. His approach is highly sympathetic. He writes as a lover of his native land, its pioneers, its lore. He expresses the feelings of the early inhabitants and their pastors, and quotes many letters and not a few verses to bring that feeling to his readers. He has photographs of many of the pioneer priests and prelates and five maps to illustrate the organization of the Church in the northern counties of California. What could not conveniently be woven into the narrative has been put in eighty pages of notes and appendices. His task of organizing his materials into readable chapters was undoubtedly a difficult one. It is difficult even in fixed communities to assemble data on early beginnings of parishes, but Father Walsh's task was doubly difficult in that he had to follow gold rushes and later account for ghost towns, neither of which is inclined to yield much in the way of working material for the scholar. Californians will enjoy reading this book, and many who do not know the land well will come to an appreciation of its struggle and growth. Moreover, the volume may well serve as a history of the early Catholic churches and pastors of the twenty-five northern counties of California.

\* \* \* \*

*Franciscan Education and the Social Order in Spanish North America (1502-1821)*, by Pius Joseph Barth, O.F.M., was published by the author in Chicago in 1945. This is a dissertation in 431 pages submitted to the faculty of the Division of Social Sciences of the University of Chicago for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education. It is a painstaking and noteworthy work. Father Barth has gathered his materials from the important libraries, archives and secondary writings in the field of Franciscan history. He has presented these in a new form and in the terminology erected around education. It is no small contribution to have modern labels on aged ideas, and to have assessed the Franciscan plans and practices in the light of recent educational psychology. It is also an achievement to have performed this long-needed work in considerable detail.

There are seventeen chapters and forty-four illustrations. In the final chapter Father Barth summarized his conclusions regarding the nature of the education given by the Franciscans in North America. He finds that the friars "were interested in the common mass education of a submerged race of people, not only for the good of both state and church, but also for their own individual and social advancement"; as to higher education: "there appears to be less Franciscan emphasis for advanced schooling in North America than in South America"; thirdly, the "Franciscan education in Spanish North America was quite democratic and opportunistic."

\* \* \* \*

*Major Trends in American Church History*, by Francis X. Curran, S.J., published by The American Press, is a brief survey of the historical evolution of the Christian churches in the United States. The trends of the institutional development of the religions in America are traced in eleven chapters, 170 pages, and an appendix lists the Protestant sects now extant in this country. Father Curran considers the average American to be in complete, unashamed, and lamentable ignorance of the religious history of his country. Since the essays in the book are of a very general and comprehensive nature and since the terminology is difficult, it is hard to see just how the book will be very enlightening to the 70,000,000 people in this country who have no acquaintance with religion. While it has some apologetic value and may be used as a guide in the hands of a skillful teacher, who may enlarge on the generalizations and amplify the historical background, the book cannot be said to aim at any particular group of readers, and it seems beyond the reading level of many of those for whom it was destined.

\* \* \* \*

*Carolina Chronicle, The Papers of Commissary Gideon Johnston, 1707-1716*, edited with an introduction and notes by Frank J. Klingberg, was published by the University of California Press, 1946. This is Volume 35 of the University of California Publications in History. Gideon Johnson was sent to the colony of Carolina as the representative of the Bishop of London to organize the Anglican Church, and later to act as a missionary for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Each of the religious groups of missionaries coming to the Americas received support monies and other help from an Old World organization similar to the above-mentioned Anglican Society and the Catholic

Society for the Propagation of the Faith. In the case of Commissary Johnson the scene for organization and evangelization was South Carolina, and more particularly Charles Town. He and the hundreds of other ministers of the gospel were by rule required to report to London at regular intervals following a questionnaire procedure. Thus, information about the new land, social conditions, economic affairs, health, sanitation, crime, defence against Indians and raiders, and many other items may be gathered from the reports sent back to the motherland. Such papers from Gideon Johnson have been brought together in this volume by Mr. Klingberg. The general picture is the revelation of a homesick man struggling under various handicaps of illness and debt in a productive land afflicted by plagues and other calamities, but many of the less personal details are good observations on conditions.

\* \* \* \*

*Catholics and the Civil War*, by the Reverend Benjamin J. Blied, was published by St. Francis Seminary of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, in 1945. It is a series of ten essays in 150 pages, designed to complement the studies already made and serve as a help to others who wish to make detailed and definitive research. The volume fulfills its purpose. We find in it answers to questions about the attitudes of individual Catholics toward great phases of our national development, as well as local, diocesan, official Catholic Church, and Catholic press attitudes. The general conclusions are not new, nor will time change them much, but some of the particular fragments are contributions, especially the illuminating chapter revealing the expressions of sorrow by press and prelate over the assassination of Lincoln. On other questions we find that Catholics fought in both armies during the Civil War; some held slaves and some did not; some bishops approved slavery, some disapproved; some Catholics were for abolition, but all were against Abolitionists; despite political, social, and economic differences on many of these important questions, Catholics regularly divorced these ideas from their religious beliefs and remained in the unity of the Faith.

\* \* \* \*

"Fourth of July Myths," by Charles Warren, appeared in *The William and Mary Quarterly for July*, 1945. According to the findings of Mr. Warren, which are amply substantiated, the true Independence Day is July 2. The Resolution Establishing Independence was drafted by the Continental Congress on June 2, 1776. It was

passed on July 2, adopted July 4, proclaimed on July 8. All signers did not affix their signatures on July 4, since some were not present at the meeting that day. Again, The Declaration of Independence was not the title of the famous document. It was first referred to as the "Declaration," and later as "The Declaration on Independence." On July 2 it was termed "the declaration respecting independency." On July 4 and July 8 it was: A Declaration by the Representatives of the United States in America in Congress Assembled. And on July 19 Congress ordered that the official title should be: "The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen States of America." Another myth is banished when Mr. Warren shows that there is no record that the Liberty Bell was rung on July 4 or on any day previous to this while the Congress was in session. Sixty years later it was first referred to as the Liberty Bell and then in reference to freedom for slaves. The story about the Liberty Bell being rung on July 4, 1776, began in 1847. Finally, as to Fourth of July celebrations, the first of these was a local political celebration in 1777. The first official recognition of the day was made by Massachusetts in 1781.

Elsewhere in this number we find an article "For the Study of American History: The Newberry Library," by Ruth Lapham Butler. This is one of a series of articles in this quarterly on American collections and library treasures. It is capably done and leads us to suggest that these articles be gathered together for presentation in book form.

\* \* \* \*

A more pleasant shock to historians comes from the pen of Professor O. M. Dickerson, who, in an article in the March, 1946, *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, poses the question: "John Hancock: Notorious Smuggler or Near Victim of British Revenue Racketeers?" and arrives at the answer that our famous signer of the Declaration of Independence was a worthy, unselfish patriot, not a smuggler. Professor Emeritus Dickerson first presents the evidence for the smuggling charges and lists the historians who have left the impression of Hancock's guilt, or who have openly stated it. He finds the evidence garbled and false. Hancock in having aboard his ship some oil and tar, not wine, was held in technical violation of the revenue law, and since he was considered a notable patriot, was singled out from among many captains who were like himself supposing that the laws were not being enforced and that they would not be bothered about technical points. When the cargo was

confiscated Governor Bernard received a third of the property and revenue officers also got their share for their personal use. The whole story was soon known. It touched off a riot in Boston, the first against such public plundering. The testimony of one Thomas Kirk, on which the charge of smuggling rested, is analyzed by Professor Dickerson and branded a perjury. The next questions—Was Hancock the near victim of British revenue racketeers? Who were these? What were they seeking in the way of hush money?—are clearly answered, and happily to the credit of John Hancock.

In the same number of this *Review* are some very important comments on Robert S. Henry's earlier article, "The Railroad Land Grant Legend in American History Texts." Eight historians offer their comments on what Colonel Henry found in the textbooks used by Americans and on what he published as his own findings and suggestions. Moreover, other interesting points are brought up for discussion and solution.

\* \* \* \*

Jokes at length have been granted formal space in an historical review. A few pages headed by the title "Incidents and Coincidences" made a timid bow in the July, 1945, *Missouri Historical Review*, and then disappeared from the following numbers. Although humor, to say nothing of humorous things, has at times found a final haven in scholarly magazines, this was to the best of our knowledge the first time jokes have been formally incorporated among historical items. The collection was from various metropolitan newspapers of Missouri.

Throughout the War this *Review* has been carrying articles under the general title: "Missouri and the War," and these promise to become permanent records for future reference. The April, 1946, number has a long list of Missourians who have received decorations in the Navy.

\* \* \* \*

*Pacific Northwest Quarterly* has in its April, 1946, pages an article of interest at this particular time of the United Nations meeting. This is "Pacific Northwest Opinion on the Washington Conference of 1921-1922," by Winston B. Thorson. The author points out the basic similarity of the problems of 1921 and 1946. He then recounts opinions about the success or lack of success of the treaties, resolutions, declarations, and special agreements made in the Washington Conference. Between the extreme opinions of those who condemned the United States policy and those who lauded it, Pro-



fessor Thorson proposes a more moderate appraisal, namely, that the Conference was a significant factor in moderating our world and Pacific relations during the 1920's. He then surveys the opinions of the Northwest as expressed in editorials and concludes that most editors considered that significant progress had been made. They were hopeful of permanent peace. Some others, however, were highly realistic and realized that the true foundations for lasting world peace had not been laid.

\* \* \* \*

The Chicago Historical Society is now publishing a quarterly named *Chicago History*. Its editor is Paul M. Angle, who recently became secretary and director of the Society after his successful years of librarianship at the Illinois State Library in Springfield. The new publication is the first pocket-sized historical journal that has come to our attention. Its purpose is stated in the mast-head as "an informal publication devoted in the main to the Society's museum, library, and activities." Chicagoans and visitors to Chicago will welcome the news found in this helpful publication.

\* \* \* \*

Those who are concerned about the congressional legislation regarding the National Science Foundation may find an article to their liking in *The Pacific Historical Review* for March, 1946. It is "The Social Sciences in the National Science Foundation," by Professor Louis Knott Koontz. After an introduction in which he points out that the social sciences were given practically no place in the federal plans for research during wartime, Professor Koontz gives the history of the bills introduced in Congress for the establishment and conduct of a very broad research agency in Washington under federal sponsorship, which bills have gradually broadened the scope of the research undertakings so as to include the social sciences. The bill to establish a National Science Foundation was introduced in the Senate on July 23, 1945, and it was known as S. 1297. Then in September President Truman in his message to Congress asked that this bill be extended to include the social sciences along with the basic sciences. For the public hearings a hundred witnesses from all over the United States were giving their testimony for nearly a month beginning October 8. These were all outstanding leaders in business, agriculture, labor, engineering, biology, et cetera, and from the fields of social sciences and humani-

ties. And their testimony finally summed up to a thousand printed pages of "choice comments on everything from Robinson Crusoe to the atomic bomb." Professor Koontz then gives many of the comments. The witnesses were unanimously for the establishment of a central Federal agency to aid research. Appended to the article is a summary of the progress of the legislation to February 20, 1946.

\* \* \* \*

A wide variety of topics of historical interest appears in the *Michigan History* for April-June of the present year. "History as a Living Force," by Christopher Crittenden, is a reprint of the article which appeared in *The Social Studies*; "Old Detroit: Drainage and Land Forms," by Bert Hudgins, is a geographic and geologic study; "Appointments to the Michigan Supreme and Chancery Courts, 1836-1850," by Clark F. Norton, is the continuation of a study of interest to political scientists and lawyers; "Century of Service," is a survey of Marygrove College by Sister M. Rosalita; and other articles are on workmen's compensation in Michigan, the 34th Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and the Michigan poetess, Elizabeth M. Chandler. These with other shorter items make up an issue of the magazine that runs over two hundred pages.

\* \* \* \*

*Thought* in its March, 1946, number carried an editorial on "The Hayes Mission to Spain," by Ross Hoffman. In this Dr. Hoffman reviews *Wartime Mission to Spain, 1942-1945*, of Carlton J. H. Hayes, and makes some very pertinent observations, first about the success of Mr. Hayes in carrying out his task of transforming Spain from a state of hostile "non-belligerency" into a state of benevolent neutrality, and secondly about the host of enemies that have since wasted the fruits of a notable diplomatic victory.

\* \* \* \*

A welcome addition to the field of scholarly publications comes in the form of the *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*. The first number is dated January 1946. The scope of the magazine is indicated as: "The prompt publication of work relating to all aspects of the history of medicine, public health, dentistry, nursing, pharmacy, veterinary medicine and the various sciences that impinge on medicine." The publisher is Henry Schu-

man, 20 East 70th Street, New York 21, New York. The quarterly has a board of five editors headed by George Rosen, forty-three consulting editors in the United States, and twenty-two in foreign countries. Germany, Austria, Italy and other middle and south-eastern European countries are not represented, nor are any of the orientals. The new Journal does not intend to be a competitor of the *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, but rather purposes to supplement the studies presented in the *Bulletin* and to offer articles of as wide an interest as possible to members of the medical profession.

\* \* \* \*

"Ohio Medical History," Part VI, practically filled the pages of *The Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* for October, 1945. Medicos of the present day might glance with some amusement at "Cleveland Doctors and their Fees" (about 1840), by Dr. Howard Dittrick. According to the "Fee Table" the doctor should charge one dollar for the first visit, but five dollars if his opinion were in writing. For extracting a tooth the fee was fifty cents; for amputating toes or fingers it was five dollars, an arm thirty dollars, and a leg fifty dollars. Other articles give interesting data on equipment, drugs, and the training of medicos.

\* \* \* \*

A list of books on the World at War, prepared by the staff of the Michigan State Library, Lansing, was published in the October, 1945, *Michigan History*, pages 588-605. The titles are classified as campaigns, personal narratives, branches of the service, combatant countries, personalities, peace and reconstruction, economic and monetary problems, and international problems.

\* \* \* \*

Business firms should preserve their manuscripts for future research, according to two writers in the *Journal of Economic History* for May, 1945. But it is difficult to persuade all New York firms to take care of their records, so far as the New York Committee on Business Records can find, and it is difficult for librarians and archivists to organize, calendar, and care for the collections thus far donated. The first big need is the establishment of some reasonable procedure by which the materials can at least be preserved.

"The Progressive Movement in the South, 1870-1914," by Arthur S. Link, appears in *The North Carolina Historical Review* for April, 1946. The author begins with some definitions of terms, and this is rather noteworthy. "Progressives," he says, "are usually persons who strive for reforms that alleviate the ills of society, that assure the people a broader control of their governments, and that look toward affording greater economic, political, and social justice to the people. These progressives are the so-called 'liberals,' not 'radicals';" and where basic property rights and the capitalistic system are concerned, they are conservative. Dr. Link then shows, contrary to the opinion expressed by Senator Robert M. La Follette, that the Granger movement took root in South Carolina in 1871 and spread widely in the South. The Granges there fought a losing fight against railroad malpractices similar to what occurred in the North. So too, the other moves for progressive legislation, the Farmers Alliance and Populism, made good headway in the southern states, and many leaders for national reform developed in the South.

## Book Reviews

*Historia de la Leyenda Negra Hispano-Americana.* By Rómulo D. Carbia.  
Buenos Aires: Ediciones Orientación Española, 1943. Pp. 240.

"The conquistadores came from Spain to seek their fortune in the shape of gold and silver and to return home with it as soon as possible." (12) "The important fact for us to remember is that Spain, using the Caribbean islands and the isthmus of Panama as bases, got a stranglehold on the neck of empire in the New World, and so were able to sieze its riches, to cover over its native culture with a layer of western civilization, and to make slaves or serfs of millions of its most advanced aboriginal peoples. (10)

In the lines above we have a typical expression of the Black Legend. The numbers refer to pages, and the book cited is the latest product of Yale's distinguished professor of diplomatic history and inter-American relations, Samuel Flagg Bemis. (*The Latin American Policy of the United States*. 1943.)

The legend in question may be stated more baldly, of course, in the traditional expression that "the Spaniards engaged in a systematic campaign to loot America and exterminate its natives." Whether this *bon mot* corresponds with the facts in the story is quite another point. Today one has no excuse for believing it, after the long, patient, methodical and sometimes brilliant efforts of a whole school of historians whose names can be found at the masthead of the *Hispanic American Historical Review* and a number of kindred journals, including the one before the reader.

But the point is that it is believed. Last year the American Council on Education published a report (*Latin America*) on the teaching materials used in our schools and colleges in Latin American subjects. Chapter Three of the report treats of "a more serious matter," the widespread continuation in our textbooks of the Black Legend. This legend, says the report, pictures the colonial policy in Latin America as a combination of "ineptitude, cruelty, faithlessness, greed and bigotry." It is there called "the ancient body of propaganda against the Iberian peoples which began in sixteenth century England and has since been a handy weapon for the rivals of Spain and Portugal in the religious, maritime and colonial wars of these four centuries." The chapter concludes that "this prejudice has greatly diminished in the present century but it is still too strong and pervasive."

To say that the legend is "believed" connotes that it is "taken on the word of another." Careful students of the subject today do not "believe" or "hold" it. But the number of those who do teach and write it belies understanding.

In an effort to discover how this legend arose, and how it grew until the whole of western Europe took it for granted and passed it down to our times, Doctor Carbia determined on a thorough investigation of this item in the history of ideas. His work deserves the most careful attention.

Before his untimely death last summer, Carbia enjoyed a reputation of leadership among the Argentine scholars in history. A doctor in American history, professor in the Universities of Buenos Aires and La Plata, his



special interest lay in verification of documentary evidence touching the discovery of the New World. His fundamental work, *El Problema del descubrimiento de América desde el punto de vista de la valoración de sus fontes* (Buenos Aires, 1935), won him wide respect as an exemplar of the canons of historical method.

In the title under review, his attention focuses on the origin and transmission of the legend. Only incidentally does he touch on its correspondence with reality.

The beginning of the narrative, as all who study it now understand, is the accusation of Bartolomé de las Casas that in the Indies his countrymen were embarked on the aforesaid systematic campaign of loot and annihilation. Las Casas had no idea of the progeny he would beget. As soon as his *Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias* appeared in 1552, it fell into the hands of enemies of Spain. Dutchmen, happy for a propaganda weapon against their masters, did a masterful job of publishing the diatribe, with a set of stark illustrations to enforce the printed page. Theodore De Bry, the Fleming of Liege, was the efficient decorator, his edition done in German at Frankfort in 1596. As time went on, anti-Habsburg France copied the pictures and issued numerous editions. England and the Germanies followed suit, and anti-Spanish Italians sponsored various Latin translations. After 1660 the legend passed into accepted fact. Frenchmen of the eighteenth century, men of such diverse views as Voltaire and Charlevoix, Pufendorf and Raynal, used the chapters of Las Casas to prove everything from Rousseau's "state of pure nature" to the complete indictment of Spanish depravity. Spaniards themselves, when ill at ease toward their rulers, adopted the canard without question. And, as Bemis proves, the chain is not yet broken.

Part of the study considers the effort to roll back this broad offensive battleline. Though this section properly concludes the study, its elements appear early in the book and give a special balance to what would otherwise be very pessimistic reading.

The competence of Carbia, as was said above, shows in his full command of the historical method. He knows his principles, and his product is as thorough as it is dispassionate. Three large divisions treat successively the origin and diffusion of the legend, its exploitation, and its repudiation. Each topic exhibits a coverage of the immense literature involved in this highly complicated problem. Points of emphasis in the interpretative work are the evidence furnished by Las Casas—with check and countercheck from contemporaries—and the methods and motives employed by his propagators. The legend is exploited by the Reformers, the *Tolerantes* or *philosophes*, the revolutionaries and the Spanish Liberalists.

A final and satisfying investigation explains the historical rejection of the propaganda story. From the first, thoughtful and learned men saw how it fed religious and political hatred, and they battled it in the name of truth and international goodwill. To the Scot William Robertson, Carbia gives chief credit for its repudiation, thus buttressing previous if scanty studies on the same theme. At this point he might have included a larger list of American scholars, for Leslie B. Simpson, in particular, contributed a notable chapter on the subject in his *Encomienda in New Spain*. Others of our authors, less by direct attack than by the indirect method of telling

what actually went on in the Indies in those days, confine the legend to deserved obscurity.

It is to be hoped that some generous spirit will turn this essay into English. Few books have greater claim to translation. Above all, the ample footnotes should be made available, for they put the study on a basis of unquestionable solidity, as to bibliography and critical analysis. The printing and format are first class.

W. EUGENE SHIELS, S.J.

University of Detroit.

*Greater America Essays in Honor of Herbert Eugene Bolton.* The University of California Press, Berkeley, 1945. Pp. ix, 723. Illustrated.

Some years ago the students trained by Professor Bolton conceived the plan of honoring him on the occasion of his retirement. The plan was to produce a group of essays for presentation when the moment of retirement arrived. They failed to see that an institution cannot be retired, and when the time set by arbitrary regulations arrived, Professor Bolton proved to be in no physical or mental shape for surcease from his customary labor and he was, according to rumor, less ready for rest than some of his former students. Consequently, the long-delayed volume was presented to Dr. Bolton in late December of 1945 in "appreciation of his inspiration and guidance."

The scope of the essays is as wide as the Bolton concept of American history. There are twenty-seven essays in 533 pages, and these are followed by "A Bibliography of the Writings of Herbert Eugene Bolton," and "A Bibliography of the Historical Writings of the Students of Herbert Eugene Bolton." Twelve excellent maps and a fine index complete the physical aspects of the volume in a most pleasing manner.

According to the preface of the editors the essays are abridgments of complete monographs and their subjects "range geographically from Patagonia to Alaska, and chronologically from the age of discovery to the twentieth century," and they touch a wide variety of human endeavor. The opening essay is on "The Treaty of Tordesillas and the Diplomatic Background of American History." Thereafter, the subjects are the Spanish horse in Peru, the famous mining town of Potosí, Spanish voyages to the Far East, silk culture in colonial Mexico, education in colonial Hispanic America, missions and missionaries in New Spain, riots over social and economic troubles in the seventeenth century Mexico, Indian policy in Louisiana, Negro slavery in New Granada, the City of the Caesars, the colonization of Patagonia, New England traders in Spanish California, the Mormon advance westward, and others of no less interest. Each of the essays has a short bibliography of essential materials.

The volume like its predecessor in 1932 is more than a monument to an inspiring and esteemed professor. It is an indication of an influence on historical thought and procedure that is wider even than the Americas. Those who contributed to this and the preceding volume in honor of Professor Bolton, are now spread out over the country teaching a new generation the concept of American history that has become almost universal. In this concept, localism, sectionalism, bias of any sort, and exaggerated na-

tionalism gives way before a broad spirit of democracy. Much of this spirit has already penetrated the nations of this hemisphere, and much of the defeat of provincialism has been owing to the human understanding and directive force of Dr. Bolton.

JEROME V. JACOBSEN

Loyola University, Chicago.

*Guide to the American Historical Review, 1895-1945.* Edited by Franklin D. Scott and Elaine Teigler. Published in the Annual Report of the American Historical Association For the Year 1944, Vol. I, pp. 65-292. (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1945.)

Students of American history will welcome the publication of this useful guide. It is topically arranged, and contains the listing of articles, notes, and documents published in the *American Historical Review* from 1895 to 1945. Brief descriptive notes accompany most of the articles listed.

Yet, a separate listing of all the presidential addresses of the Association would have been a useful addition.

The student of Hispanic American history will find thirty items on relations between the United States and Spain (most of them limited to the diplomacy of the Western Frontier during the period of the American Revolution); twenty-one items on relations between the United States and Hispanic America (most of them on the Mexican War); twelve items on Anglo-Spanish and Hispanic American relations in the colonial period and three items on Anglo-Hispanic American relations during the wars of independence south of the Rio Grande; two items on relations between France and Hispanic America in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; one item on relations between Russia and Hispanic America during the wars of independence in that area; twenty-one items on Hispanic American history (these consist of seven articles dealing with the Age of Discovery, one on the mission as a frontier institution in the Spanish American colonies, and one on Hidalgo and Morelos, all written between 1899 and 1917, with the exception of two of the articles on Columbus; the remaining items are miscellaneous notes and documents); and nine items on Spanish history (six articles, and three bibliographical notes).

Of the Hispanic items referred to above, the most notable revelation of the *Guide* is that the *American Historical Review* has not published a single article on Spanish history since 1918, and of the total of six articles published on the subject, four are on the Spanish Inquisition, published by Lea between the years 1895 and 1906, one by Merriman on the Middle Ages published in 1911, and one by Haring on Spanish colonial administration, published in 1916. No bibliographical note on Spanish history or historical writing about Spain, has been published by the *Review* since 1927. A few other reviews published in the United States have contained an occasional article on Spanish history. However, Spanish social and political history, in the ancient, mediaeval and modern periods, pursued by competently trained professional historians, continues to remain one of the most neglected fields of historical investigation in the United States.

J. MANUEL ESPINOSA

Washington, D. C.